



1937

The Relation of Senator Stephen A. Douglas to the State of Illinois

E. Marie Haley
Loyola University Chicago

Recommended Citation

Haley, E. Marie, "The Relation of Senator Stephen A. Douglas to the State of Illinois" (1937). *Master's Theses*. Paper 625.
http://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses/625

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/).
Copyright © 1937 E. Marie Haley

24

THE RELATION OF SENATOR STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS
TO THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

BY

E. MARIE HALEY

A thesis submitted in partial fulfil-
ment of the requirements for the
degree of
Master of Arts
in
Loyola University
June, 1937

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I	Page
Illinois and the Railroad Question 1840-1860.....	1
The settlers of northern and southern Illinois - Need of satisfactory transportation facilities for farmers - Growing desire for railroad construction - Plan for a central railroad presented to Legislature by Hon. Sydney Breese - Grant of a railroad charter to the Cairo City and Canal Company - Repeal of that charter - Development of "State Policy" - Opposition to this policy by the southern section of Illinois-Salem convention - Hillsboro convention - Interest of Illinois in a Pacific railroad.	
CHAPTER II	
Senator Douglas' Interest in Railroads	19
Coming of Stephen A. Douglas to Illinois - His recognition of the importance of railroad building - Efforts of Holbrook to secure preemption rights - The opposition of Douglas to Holbrook's schemes - His discovery of fraud - His success in defeating Holbrook and in obtaining the land grant for Illinois - Douglas' disapproval of "State Policy" - Whitney's plan for a Pacific railroad - Opposition of Douglas to the plan - Conflict between northern and southern interests in a Pacific railroad - Memphis convention - St. Louis convention - Efforts of Douglas to secure the building of a road to the Pacific.	
CHAPTER III	
Douglas and Illinois on River and Harbor Improvement, and Disposal of Public Lands	42
Importance of river and harbor improvements - Interest of people in Illinois in river and harbor improvement - Andrew Jackson's principles of internal improvements interpreted by Douglas - Douglas and tonnage duties - The press and tonnage duties - Douglas' criticism of numerous small appropriations - Homestead and preemption policies - Efforts of Douglas to secure passage of a homestead bill - Bounty grants to soldiers - Donation of land by Douglas for University of Chicago.	

CHAPTER IV

Douglas and the Slavery Issue in Illinois Before 1854..... 62
Slavery sentiments of early Illinois settlers - Growth of
abolitionist movement after 1840 - Free Soil Party
organized - Douglas' associations with the South - Wilmot
Proviso - Opposition of Douglas to the Proviso - Agitation
and debate over compromise measures of 1850 - Chicago's
attitude toward the Fugitive Slave Act - Douglas' defense
of the Act - Douglas adopts "popular sovereignty" theory -
Interest of Missouri in the organization of Nebraska -
Nebraska bill introduced by Senator Dodge - Kansas-Nebraska
bill reported by Douglas - Attack of bill by Chase - The
Nebraska territory and the Pacific railroad - Douglas struggles
to obtain passage of the Kansas-Nebraska bill.

CHAPTER V

Douglas and the Slavery Issue in Illinois - 1854-1861..... 83
Opposition to repeal of Missouri Compromise - Attempt of
Douglas to defend the measure in Chicago - Bitter
opposition to the clergy and the Know-Nothing organization
-The Germans in Chicago and the Kansas-Nebraska Act - The
Illinois Press and the Kansas-Nebraska Act - Douglas' tour
of Illinois - The Kansas problem - The Lecompton Constitution
-Douglas breaks with Buchanan - Douglas regains favor of his
constituents - Split in Democratic ranks - Election of
Lincoln - Devotion of Douglas to the Union - Douglas wins
support for Union in Illinois - Death and burial of Douglas.

CHAPTER I

ILLINOIS AND THE RAILROAD QUESTION 1840-1860

"The general assembly shall encourage internal improvements, by passing liberal general laws of incorporation for that purpose."¹ Thus did the Constitution of the State of Illinois place upon the shoulders of the lawmakers of the state the responsibility of providing adequate transportation facilities. It cannot be said that the Legislature ignored this duty, but its efforts in that direction were rather seriously frustrated for a period of years by an acute sectional antagonism which developed between the northern and southern parts of Illinois.

The southern part of the state was settled principally by people from the slave holding states. They had established a line of settlements along the Wabash, Ohio, and Mississippi rivers,² and pushed northward along these waterways into the timbered lands and into the unglaciated lead mining districts about Galena.³ The northeastern section was settled, for the most part, by emigrants from New York and New England, who moved into the smaller prairies between the rivers.⁴ Over this area the Wisconsin glacier had deposited a rich chemical compound making it one of the best agricultural regions of the United States. Crop yields indicated that the Illinoisian drift of the southern and western parts was much less fertile.⁵ These New

1. Fred Gerhard, Illinois As It Is, Keen and Lee, Chicago, 1857, p.160.

2. Paul Wallace Gates, The Illinois Central Railroad and Its Colonization Work, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1934, p.7.

3. Ibid., p.13

4. Ibid., p.13

5. Ibid., p.6

York and New England pioneers consisted of wealthy farmers, enterprising merchants, millers, and manufacturers, who developed farms, built mills, churches, and schools, started towns and cities, and constructed roads. In point of wealth and of institutions of higher civilization they were soon ten years in advance of their southern neighbors, in spite of the fact that the settlements of these neighbors had been established from twenty to fifty years longer.⁶

Few southern counties supported libraries, and the counties most distinctly southern in origin had a high percentage of illiteracy.⁷ This state of affairs has been partially explained as the result of geographic conditions. A great part of southern Illinois land was marshy and swampy, fully one third of the area of some counties being under water. Because the early pioneer did not understand the laws of health and sanitation, ague and malaria prevailed. As a consequence the hardy emigrant from the southern states developed into a shiftless, lazy individual whose principal desire was to be left undisturbed by the later immigrant to the north of him.⁸ His lack of sympathy with the thrifty, energetic "Yankees" of the northeast section amounted to a feeling closely akin to hatred.⁹ Because it seemed more likely to benefit the northern inhabitants of Illinois and thus attract a flood of the objectionable New Englanders to the state, the settler of the southern areas objected to the completion of the Illinois-Michigan canal.¹⁰

6. Gov. Thomas Ford, A History of Illinois from its Commencement as a State in 1818 to 1847, S.C. Griggs and Company, Chicago, 1854, pp.279-280; Arthur Charles Cole, The Era of the Civil War 1848-1870, Centennial Commission, Springfield, 1919, p.14.
7. Allen Johnson, "Illinois as a Constituency in 1850" Iowa Journal of History and Politics, III, 402 July, 1905.
8. Gates, p.9.
9. Johnson, "Illinois as a Constituency" p.402.
10. Ibid., p.402.

The settlers in the northern section of the state were no less hostile. Southern Illinois had won a reputation as an unhealthy area.¹¹ Frequently the reputation as an unhealthy area included the entire state, an error which, of course, the northern inhabitants resented.¹² The public press was used extensively and forcibly to counteract this notion. Great pains were taken to point out the difference between the two sections, always to the disadvantage of the one to the south.¹³ The result of these various controversies was a breach between the sections which affected state policies for some time.

Ever since the entrance of the pioneer farmer into the West a satisfactory means of transporting his products to market had been one of his outstanding problems. During the late forties the inhabitants of Illinois seemed to become even more aware that their state's development was being retarded to an immeasurable degree by the lack of adequate transportation facilities. The Mississippi and Illinois rivers were the main arteries of trade,¹⁴ but river improvement to make these, as well as other streams, navigable at all times was aided by neither State nor Federal government.¹⁵ Common roads and stage roads were of a very poor sort, and thirty-six counties where lived two-fifths of the state's population had only these unimproved mud roads over which to get their crops to market.¹⁷ The Illinois-Michigan canal, begun in 1825 and completed in 1848, did increase the interest of settlers

11. Gates, p.9

12. Ibid., p.10.

13. Ibid., p.10.

14. Ibid., p.14.

15. Cole, p.27.

16. Gates, p.14.

17. Cole, p.32.

in the prairie lands, but only in its immediate vicinity.¹⁸ Fertile regions located even twenty miles from a canal, river, or lake remained untouched.¹⁹ The rich prairies of the eastern counties were no match for the less fertile areas of the extreme southern and northern portions of the state. In the late forties one-third of the land of Illinois²⁰ remained in the hands of the Federal government, for settlements any distance from navigable rivers were not made because of the cost and inconvenience of transportation. Farmers found it impossible to raise their produce for the small price it brought. Some held it over until spring when it could be shipped by way of the Great Lakes to New York.²⁰ The farmers on the Rock river required five days to market thirty bushels of wheat and received not more than ten or twelve dollars in cash for their load. Farmers from the southern counties often brought green and dried apples, butter, hams, bacon, feathers, etc. to Chicago from a distance of two or three hundred miles. They camped along the way and saved enough to buy a few bags of coffee and some salt.²¹

Mining was also at a disadvantage because of inadequate transportation. There existed considerable mineral wealth to be tapped, but only that which was convenient to a market was being mined.²²

As a solution to this problem railroad construction seemed to be the most promising. The need for an opening up of the resources of unsettled areas by a north and south route was manifested, and a few cross-lines which might be used as connections with the eastern trunk lines to the Atlantic

18. Gates, p.20.

19. Cole, p.32.

20. Mabel McIlvaine, Reminiscences of Chicago During the Forties and Fifties Lakeside Press, Chicago, 1913, p.74-75.

21. Ibid., p.75.

22. Cole, p.32

Howard Gray Brownson, History of the Illinois Central Railroad to 1870 University of Illinois, Urbana, 1915 p.14

and with the Mississippi water route seemed desirable. In addition to these rather general demands, isolated communities were anxious for short lines to connect with undeveloped mineral deposits, near-by markets, and navigable water routes.

To satisfy these desires several projects seemed worthy of support. There was the proposition for a central railroad from Cairo to the terminus of the Illinois-Michigan canal with branches to Galena and Chicago; the suggestion of a connection between Chicago and Galena as a continuation of the Michigan Central and as a link between the Atlantic coast and the Mississippi river; the idea of an extension of the Northern Cross road from Springfield and from Meredosia to complete the "lateral bisection of the State;" and the mention of a line between Springfield and Alton with the possibility of a later extension northward to Chicago.²³

In the whole system Cairo was commonly thought of as the southern market for Illinois, and Springfield as the halfway station. It was generally conceded that Alton and Galena would have the advantage of being termini and that places like Rockford would be rescued from isolation.²⁴

During the fall of 1835 Honorable Sydney Breese called attention to the plan for a central railroad to connect the southern terminus of the Illinois-Michigan canal with the confluence of the Ohio and Mississippi rivers at Cairo, but failure to unite this project with the canal for which an appropriation of one half million had been granted resulted in a railroad charter being given to the Cairo City and Canal Company.²⁵ This company had

23. Cole, p.33

24. Ibid., p.33

25. Alexander Davidson and Bernard Stuve, A Complete History of Illinois from 1673-1884, R.W. Rokker, Springfield, Ill., 1884, p.573.

been originally incorporated to construct dikes and levees to protect Cairo and the adjacent country during flood periods. Its incorporators were Darius B. Holbrook, also the company's president, Miles A. Gilbert, John S. Hacker, Alexander M. Jenkins, Anthony Olney; and William M. Walker.²⁶

Application was made by this company to Congress for aid by pre-emption, but before anything was done the State of Illinois entered upon a great internal improvement system in 1837. The state, not wishing a rival, demanded the surrender of the charter it had granted to the Cairo company. The surrender was made on the condition that the state build a road from Cairo through Vandalia, Shelbyville, Decatur, Bloomington, Peru, and by way of Dixon to Galena, but the grand system encountered financial difficulties and collapsed in 1840. By an Act of March 6, 1843 the Cairo company under the title of the Great Western Railway Company was granted the power to construct a road through the above mentioned places to the southern terminus of the Illinois-Michigan canal. In addition to the usual franchises the company was guaranteed that all lands that came into its possession either by donation or purchase were pledged in advance to secure the payment of all bonds and obligations of the company.²⁷ An Act of March 3, 1845, repealed this charter, but by this time the people of Illinois were becoming very serious minded about railroad building within their state.

On January 23, 1847 the people of Fayette county held a public meeting at Vandalia and adopted a number of spirited resolutions.²⁸ In commenting upon it the Chicago Weekly Journal stressed the importance of a central

26. Ibid., p.573.

27. Ibid., p.574.

28. Editorial in Chicago Weekly Journal, February 8, 1847.

railroad not as a mere local interest, but as a universal advantage to the whole country.²⁹ On May 3, 1847, the same paper copied an article from the State Register expressing the hope that a Chicago and Galena railroad would be brought to a speedy completion. An editorial commenting upon a central railroad in another Chicago paper stated, "It may be compared to a new river opened through the State, superior to the Mississippi and Illinois, or the Ohio and Wabash, because always navigable, and free from the malaria, so fatal to human life, which their waters sometimes engender."³⁰ An article³¹ reprinted from the Mining Journal and Railroad Gazette advocated a central railway from Cairo to Chicago as one most satisfactory to all concerned.

The general interest of the people of Illinois in railroad construction is evidenced during the forties by the numerous meetings held and memorials, petitions, and resolutions presented to Congress in favor of railroad legislation. The citizens of Chicago met at the Court House January 18, 1848 to take some action on the subject of a railroad to connect the upper and lower Mississippi and the Great Lakes. The gathering unanimously adopted resolutions that such a road would be beneficial to both the state and the Union, and that the Senators and Representatives should be requested to exert their power to pass a law giving the State of Illinois the right of way and the necessary land grants to build the desired railroad.³² On January 13, 1848,

Senator Douglas had already presented a petition from Illinois citizens making a similar request.³³ It is apparent that the matter could not be

29. Ibid., Feb. 8, 1847.

30. Editorial in Chicago Daily Journal, Jan 18, 1848.

31. Editorial in Galena Weekly Jeffersonian, March 23, 1848.

32. Editorial in Chicago Daily Journal, January 20, 1848.

33. Globe, 30 Congress, 1 session, XVII, p.170.

placed in the background, for on January 30, 1849, another resolution of the State of Illinois was presented in the Senate. It favored the securing to the states of Illinois and Indiana land donations contiguous to the Alton, Mount Carmel and New Albany Railroad. At the same time there was presented a resolution favoring a grant of public land to aid in the construction of the Central and Northern Cross Railroad.³⁴ Another memorial with a similar objective was presented on January 31, 1849.³⁵

The Illinois-Michigan canal was completed in the spring of 1848, and the fact that heavy traffic began immediately, and that by 1850 and 1851 the limits of the canal were so nearly reached that certain restrictions were necessary, is an indication of the great need of adequate transportation. The opening of this canal aided the entire upper river valley. Lockport, Joliet, Ottawa, La Salle, and Peru shared the prosperity, but Chicago which was growing in importance as a lake port received the greatest advantage.³⁶ However, the settlers of downstate areas derived no direct benefit from this project, and they grew more resentful toward what they considered a discrimination policy on the part of the State Legislature. The old Northern Cross from Meredosia to Decatur was the only road in their vicinity before 1850.³⁷ They began to clamor for aid in railroad construction, but their problem grew more and more difficult because of a rivalry that developed between sections of the state over cross-state enterprises.

Those who found St. Louis their best and nearest market frequently petitioned the State Legislature to grant charters to railroads to cross the

34. Globe, 30 Congress, 2 session, XVIII, 394.

35. Globe, 30 Congress, 2 session, XVIII, 409.

36. Cole, Era of the Civil War, 29.

37. John Moses, Illinois, Historical and Statistical, Fergus Printing Co., Chicago, 1889, 568.

the state from Vincennes, Terre Haute, and other points on the Wabash to terminate at a place opposite St. Louis, but the Legislature just as frequently saw fit to reject them.³⁸ At a special session of October 1849 the Legislature again refused special charters to the Vincennes and St. Louis railroad, and also established a general railroad incorporation law so defective that no company could well organize or operate under it without further legislation.³⁹

The attitude of the Legislature of Illinois was further shown by the principles adopted by it and known as "State Policy." A declaration of these principles was passed on November 3, 1849 by 43 to 27 in the House and with only two opposing votes in the Senate.⁴⁰ These principles guided and controlled the legislation concerning railroad building in Illinois from 1849 to 1854.⁴¹ Following is a summary of the resolutions pronounced by the Legislature and known as "State Policy."⁴²

1. The geographic position of Illinois is one of the greatest natural advantages for railroad building and under a wise legislative policy would promote the welfare of the state.
2. The prosperity of a state depends in part upon the number and extent of flourishing towns, cities, and villages.
3. Any internal improvement which discourages or impedes the growth of towns, cities, or villages should not be encouraged.
4. The sixth section of the tenth article of the State Constitution should be construed to mean that the general assembly shall encourage improvements to promote internal rather than external interests.

38. Davidson and Stuve, 503.

39. *Ibid.*, 564.

40. *Ibid.*, 564.

41. *Ibid.*, 562.

42. *Ibid.*, 565.

5. A railroad from the eastern boundary of Illinois to a point opposite St. Louis would without doubt benefit St. Louis and impede the growth and prosperity of cities, towns and villages on the Illinois side of the Mississippi.
6. The state should encourage the construction of railroads from the Atlantic seaboard to its eastern boundary, and promise to grant them a right of way across Illinois, but with the reserved privilege of fixing the termini.
7. The construction of a central railroad is of great importance and laws proposing to complete such an undertaking should be encouraged providing they do not infringe too much upon the natural advantages of the state's location.

This plan proposed to develop great commercial cities within the boundaries of Illinois. Those who directed "State Policy" felt certain that this could be accomplished by controlling the extension of the railroads which already touched the state's eastern boundary. The managers of the Eastern roads were looking toward the trade of the Mississippi valley, and any line that would reach that thriving region and its mighty river north of the Ohio must cross the state of Illinois.⁴³ The location of the termini of these cross roads seemed vastly important. If the railroads couldn't be routed to aid the development of commercial centers within its boundaries, certainly they should not be granted the right of way where they would contribute to the material advantage of communities outside of the state. "State Policy" advocates were determined that none of these cross roads should terminate at St. Louis.⁴⁴ Alton, Illinois, located near the mouth of the

Missouri, was considered as favorable a commercial site for the distribution

43. Allen Johnson, Stephen A. Douglas, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1908, p.167.

44. Ibid., 167; Davidson and Stuve, 562.

of goods between the East and the West as St. Louis. Therefore those in control determined that Alton must be made the terminus of cross roads from the East.⁴⁵

Early in 1849 the Legislature of Indiana presented resolutions relative to the right of way of the Ohio and Mississippi railroad across Illinois to the committee on internal improvements in relation to railroads in Illinois.⁴⁶ The committee objected to any such grant, and a general railroad incorporation law was opposed and defeated for the following reasons.⁴⁷

1. Such a law would permit any railroad, domestic or foreign, to choose a route across the State with no consideration of the section's interests. This would be an unjust infringement upon private property.
2. It might be detrimental to other roads already built or chartered; surely in bad faith to them.
3. A road might be built on the line of and in competition with the state's great project, the Illinois-Michigan canal. This would be injurious to the state insofar as it would surely decrease the revenue derived from the canal, and it would also be unjust to the bondholders.
4. The last mentioned reason would induce shrewd capitalists to be hesitant in investing in similar projects. Hence all such improvements might be delayed.
5. Ruinous competition would be bound to arise.
6. The contention that the large cities of the Mississippi valley could not be in Illinois was deemed foolish.
7. If the statesmanship of Illinois compelled cross roads to converge at a point within Illinois, capital and wealth would be bound to be drawn there and result in a great city and commercial center.
8. Termini of cross roads if located in Illinois would become rivals of St. Louis.

The last mentioned reason was an outstanding one, and the antagonism was in no way lessened by the action of the Missouri Legislature during the winter of 1849. It levied a tax on all merchandise that was sold within the limits of Missouri, which had been grown, produced, or manufactured in any

45. Johnson, 168

46. Editorial in Illinois Republican, Belleville, February 7, 1849.

47. Davidson and Stuve, 562; Illinois Republican, February 7, 1849

state.⁴⁸ Such a sales tax seemed contrary to every principle of justice and it aroused great dissatisfaction. It was severely criticised by the press. The Illinois State Register⁴⁹ pointed out that it hit two ways. Not only did it tax produce sold in Missouri, but also the goods purchased there, for, on account of it, prices were raised. Even the press of St. Louis declared that it was a plan coming from sources more "antagonistic" than "promotive" of the city's interests. It was finally repealed by the Supreme Court of Missouri, but not until considerable harm had been done. It had served to strengthen the prejudice of Illinois toward St. Louis, a prejudice already there toward a rival commercial center.⁵⁰

However, the antagonistic jealousy of the northern part of Illinois toward St. Louis was not shared by the people of the southern section of the state. St. Louis was already a market for their produce, and they acknowledged as a very great advantage every railroad that would be built across the state to terminate at St. Louis. They felt that they were being called upon to sacrifice very real benefits for northern interests. When the northern canal was opened they had bitterly resented the discrimination which they felt was being practiced against them.⁵¹ People elsewhere took up the grievances of this southern area. The press of St. Louis, Cincinnati, and New York declared that "State Policy" would prove ruinous to the southern and middle sections of the state, and proclaimed it merely an Alton influence without any thought of the result it might have upon the general welfare of the people of Illinois. As early as 1835 certain influences in the state had

48. Davidson and Stuve, 564.
 49. Editorial in Illinois State Register, November 8, 1849.
 50. Davidson and Stuve, 564.
 51. Johnson, Stephen A. Douglas: 168

begun making a definite effort to build up Alton as the "emporium of the Mississippi valley"⁵²

An Ohio and Mississippi road from Vincennes and Cincinnati to St. Louis had been rejected because it violated "State Policy," and for the same reason the Atlantic and Mississippi railroad met with opposition when it sought to construct a line from St. Louis to Indianapolis or Terre Haute.⁵³ In reference to this latter refusal a Belleville editor printed, "It is scarcely necessary to say that this charter for the Mississippi and Atlantic Railroad was defeated in the Legislature of Illinois by local jealousy."⁵⁴

The inhabitants of southern Illinois were evidently enough disturbed to demand some action, for at the close of the winter session of 1849, eighteen or twenty general assembly members from the counties opposite St. Louis issued a stirring address to their constituents and to all concerned. They stressed the injustice that had been done to them by the Legislature and reminded their people that the north had been denied nothing while the south was blocked on every path which might lead to improved transportation. These general assembly members appealed to their constituents to send at least ten delegates from each county in the portion of the state affected to a railroad convention to be held at Salem in June for the express purpose of devising some means for obtaining relief.⁵⁵

The convention met as planned, and was attended by at least four thousand people. Ex-Governor Zadock Casey presided over the meeting, and a Mr. Wait of Bond county gave the principal address. He pointed out the injustices that were being heaped upon the aggrieved section through which

52. Davidson and Stuve, 565-566.
 53. Cole, 33.
 54. Editorial in Illinois Republican, Belleville, February 28, 1849.
 55. Ibid., Feb. 28, 1849: Davidson and Stuve, 563.

the Ohio and Mississippi railroad would run, and emphasized the advantages of St. Louis as a market for the produce of this area. He rebuked the policy of the Legislature of Illinois, and advised requesting the governor of the state to convene the Legislature in an extraordinary session for the purpose of passing a general incorporation law with liberal provisions.⁵⁶ One of the resolutions adopted by the convention leaves no doubt concerning the members' opinion of what such a law should be.⁵⁷ "Resolved, That the only general law that can be passed under the Constitution must extend the privilege of making roads from and to any and all places our people desire, that any attempt in such a law to fix the termini of roads, will be special and sectional, and entirely unwarranted by the Constitution."

Before the meeting adjourned it agreed to recommend that the people throughout the country arrange for gatherings in their local districts and do all in their power to urge the desired measures. Frequent accounts of railroad assemblies indicate that the recommendation was taken seriously⁵⁸ by those interested in railroad improvement in southern Illinois.

Governor French, who was interested in the Ohio and Mississippi road to St. Louis, was present at the Salem convention. He and the Democratic machine of Springfield were definitely opposed to "State Policy."⁵⁹ The governor concluded that the people were generally aroused over the railroad issue, and that a great impetus for railroad construction was about to be set in motion. He therefore issued a proclamation for a special session of the

56. Davidson and Stuve, 563.

57. Editorial in Illinois Republican, Belleville, June 12, 1849.

58. Illinois Republican, March 27, 1850; September 11, 1850.

59. Cole, p.34.

Legislature in October 1849, and requested that it make the subject of railroad legislation one of its chief considerations.⁶⁰

In the meantime, however, the "State Policy" advocates were not remaining entirely inactive. They entitled the Salem Convention "The Rebellion Conclave, a Rebellion against our own State,"⁶¹ and they bitterly attacked Governor French. To counteract the influences of the Salem Convention they summoned their adherents to meet at Hillsboro in Montgomery County on July 10, 1849, for they were determined to prevent any influence from gaining enough strength to terminate a cross-road outside the borders of Illinois. The convention was not held until October 4, 1849. It included a huge barbecue, and the attendance was estimated at from eight to twelve thousand people,⁶² representing fifteen or more counties. The Alton interests were well represented.⁶³

The Hillsboro Convention passed a resolution approving the action of the Legislature at its last session. Its refusal of charters to railroads leading to St. Louis was in perfect accord with "State Policy." The condemnation of Governor French for calling an extra session of the Assembly that month was so bitter that the convention was severely criticised for it.⁶⁴ It agreed to ask for the immediate adjournment of that body as soon as it had elected a United States Senator and before it took any action upon the railroad question.⁶⁵ Apparently not at all abashed, when the special session assembled Governor French called attention to the authority of the Legislature

60. Cole, 34-35; Davidson and Stuve, 563.

61. Cole, 34.

62. Ibid., 35. Davidson and Stuve, 563.

63. Davidson and Stuve, 563.

64. Editorial in Illinois State Register, October 11, 1849.

65. Davidson and Stuve, 564.

to pass laws regarding internal improvements, and he even recommended that they provide a general railroad law to settle the many controversies.⁶⁶

The supporters of "State Policy" were powerful enough in the Legislature to vote down any direct form of the St. Louis project, but its opponents wielded sufficient influence to obtain a general railroad incorporation law. The law passed by the Legislature and approved by the governor required that every road secure a special right of way and legislative action to determine its termini.⁶⁷

In spite of this law the demand for a cross road to St. Louis and for a more satisfactory general railroad law continued, but of the many enterprises suggested and sought after the most popular one was that which provided for a central highway to extend from the northern area to the southern tip of Illinois. It was supported by all sections and by both "State Policy" and anti "State Policy" parties.⁶⁸ The Mining Journal and Railroad Gazette, a Galena publication stated,

Though the policy of our State is to send southern business eastward by way of the lakes, public sentiment can only be quieted and controled on this subject by one method - there must be speedily constructed a good and expeditious route from the head of the large steam boat navigation on the Mississippi to the east by way of the lakes. Such an one - and I venture to affirm the only one which the entire Northeast can aid with safety to themselves, is the Central or Great Western Railroad of Illinois which runs from Cairo at the mouth of the Ohio to Chicago on lake Michigan.⁶⁹

And the much talked of Salem Railroad Convention passed the following resolu-

66. Cole, 35.

67. Ibid., p.35

68. Johnson, Douglas, 168; Cole, 36.

69. Reprint in Galena Weekly Jeffersonian, March 23, 1848.

tion:

Resolved, That the Great Western Railroad, formerly called the Central Railroad of Illinois, is a work of the first magnitude to the interest of the whole State, and the Company incorporated for that purpose be requested to take the earliest measures for the commencement and vigorous prosecution of the work to its completion.⁷⁰

In addition to the demand for railroad building within the state, Illinois indicated a keen interest in a Pacific railroad during the late forties.⁷¹

On October 24, 1849 the Illinois Senate communicated a proposal for a Pacific railroad which recommended Council Bluffs as an eastern terminus. At the same time it requested the Illinois senators and representatives in Congress to endeavor to secure liberal land grants to aid in the construction of four branches from the main road's eastern terminus to the cities of Chicago, Quincy, St. Louis and one either at the mouth of the Ohio River or at Memphis.⁷²

When the list of members of the various state delegations to the St. Louis railroad convention of 1849 was checked, it was learned that ten states were represented by over eight hundred delegates. Of this number two hundred sixty-six were from Illinois, an indication of the state's interest in a road to the Pacific.⁷³

All the records and writings of the late forties and early fifties suggest that railroad construction was a vital issue throughout the State of Illinois. The inhabitants clamored feverishly to attain a realization of their dreams of improved transportation facilities, until, as one writer

70. Editorial in Illinois Republican, Belleville, June 12, 1849.

71. R.S. Cotterill, "The National Railroad Convention in St. Louis, 1849," Missouri Historical Review, XII, October 1917-July 1918, 204.

72. Gates, 30.

73. Cotterill, 208.

expressed it, "It seemed that the people would not be content until a railroad was located on every four miles of the state."⁷⁴

74. Cole, 47.

CHAPTER II

SENATOR DOUGLAS' INTEREST IN RAILROADS

As the middle of the century approached, commercial rivalry matched section against section in Illinois, but the demand for more adequate transportation facilities centered the attention of the entire state around the subject of railroad building. It was at this juncture that Stephen Arnold Douglas was sent to the United States Senate by the Legislature of Illinois. Although not a native of the West, one of the great purposes of his life was the development of that region. He believed that its growth depended upon improved transportation which could best be obtained through railroad construction. He was able to visualize most accurately the affect that the entrance of the railroad would have upon a locality. Forney relates that Douglas came to him in 1853 and said, "How would you like to buy a share in Superior City, at Fond du Lac, the head of Lake Superior?"¹ He followed the question with the statement that at that point or near it would start the greatest railroad in the world, except the one just surveyed which was to open up the South. A share cost \$2500. Forney borrowed the money, bought one share, and divided it with several others, retaining only two-fifths of it for himself. From that portion he realized \$21,000.

Stephen A. Douglas was born in Brandon, Vermont, April 23, 1813. He left his native state for the West in June, 1833, arriving in Illinois late in the fall of that year. He taught school and studied enough law to be

1. John W. Forney, Anecdotes of Public Men, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1873, 19.

admitted to the bar by the judges of the Supreme Court of Illinois* on March 4, 1834.² From then on his rise in Illinois politics was steady and spectacular. He held the positions of District Attorney, member of the State Legislature, Secretary of State, Justice of the Supreme Court of Illinois, Representative from Illinois in the United States House, and finally United States Senator. He aspired to the presidency, but his attitude on the slavery question cost him that political goal. He was elected United States Senator in the fall of 1846, and took his seat in December, 1847.

As has been pointed out in the previous chapter, the only railroad project which commanded the support of all sections and factions of the State of Illinois was a central railroad from Cairo to the terminus of the Illinois-Michigan canal. As an advocate and promoter of such a road Senator Douglas truly represented his constituents.

The senior senator from Illinois at this time was Judge Sydney Breese, a friend and partner³ of Darius Holbrook, the president of the Great Western Railway Company, incorporated in 1843.⁴ Through him Holbrook sought to obtain from Congress preemption rights to enter all the lands on either side of the line of the proposed railroad at any period within ten years at a dollar and a quarter an acre.⁵ By this plan a large area of public lands might be withheld from the market for ten years without any obligation on

Mr. Holbrook's part.⁶ During the session of 1843-1844 such a bill was

2. Henry P. Willis, Stephen A. Douglas, George W. Jacobs and Company, Philadelphia, 1910, p.21.
3. James Madison Cutts, Constitutional and Party Questions, D. Appleton and Company, New York, 1866, p.188.
4. Moses, p.572.
5. Cutts, p.188.
6. Extract from speech of Mr. Douglas in Illinois State Register, October 18, 1849.

introduced by Honorable William Woodbridge, a senator from Michigan.⁷ Senator Breese reported this bill from the Committee of Public Lands of the Senate, and urged its passage which was successfully accomplished in the Senate May 10, 1844.⁸ In the House, however, it was opposed by the Illinois group led by Douglas and McClernand.

Douglas had no faith in Holbrook, who, he felt certain, would never proceed with the construction of the railroad, but instead would sell the charter with its preemption privileges in Europe.⁹ He further denounced the proposition for the following reasons:¹⁰

1. It was an extravagant speculation
2. It was injurious to the interests of the state as it would withhold eight or ten million acres of land from settlement and cultivation for ten years.
3. It created a monopoly of public lands.
4. It would injure the impression abroad of the prospects of Illinois as a growing or flourishing community.

Douglas had no idea of defeating the provision for this railroad. To the contrary he was its ardent advocate, but instead of the bill he denounced, he and the majority of his colleagues urged that an outright grant of land be made to the State of Illinois.¹¹ He believed that the state could obtain a grant as readily as preemption rights, and that a grant would make a more definite assurance of the construction of the desired road, as in all probability the Legislature would hesitate to borrow to pay a dollar and a quarter an acre for the land.¹²

7. Moses, p.572.

8. Ibid., p.572; Cutts, p.188.

9. James W. Sheahan, The Life of Stephen A. Douglas, Harper and Bros., New York, 1860, p.367; William K. Ackerman, Early Illinois Railroads, No. 23 of Fergus History Series, Fergus Printing Company, Chicago, 1884, pp.66-67.

10. Sheahan, p.367; Cutts, p.189.

11. Moses, p.572; Sheahan, p.367.

12. Editorial on speech of Douglas in Illinois State Register, Oct. 18, 1849.

No action was ever taken in the House upon the bill outlined by Woodbridge, but at the next session there was introduced in the Senate a bill identical to the last one in every respect but one. It named the State of Illinois as the grantee of the public lands instead of the Great Western Railroad Company. It was never taken up, however, and a similar bill introduced in the Senate during the session of 1846-1847 met the same fate. ¹³

Douglas spent much of the summer of 1847 traveling over the state speaking on the subject of the Illinois Central Railroad. His position on the matter may be briefly outlined as follows: ¹⁴

1. The state ought not be satisfied with a mere preemption privilege.
2. A grant of land should be made to the State of Illinois rather than to any individual corporation.
3. He promised the people that he would petition Congress to grant gratuitously to the state alternate sections of land on the condition that the road be built.
4. He urged the holding of public meetings and the signing of memorials requesting such a grant.

When the 1847 session assembled both Breese and Douglas were in the Senate. Breese again introduced a preemption bill, but Douglas would not be reconciled to its support. ¹⁵ On January 20, 1848, he introduced his bill calling for a grant to the state of Illinois of the right of way and of a donation of public lands to be used in constructing a road to connect the Upper and Lower Mississippi with Chicago. ¹⁶ Breese promptly gave up his own bill and supported the one proposed by Douglas which passed the Senate but met

13. Sheahan, p.367

14. Ibid., 368

15. Moses, 573

16. Congressional Globe, 30 Congress, 1 session, XVII, 214.

defeat in the House.¹⁷ It was introduced again during the session¹⁸ of 1848-1849, but before any action could be taken on it the House restored the previous bill to the calendar and no headway was made on either before Congress adjourned.¹⁸

In the meantime, Holbrook, not discouraged by the Legislature's repeal of the Great Western Railroad Company's charter in 1845, continued to lobby in both Washington and Springfield.¹⁹ A persistent siege by himself and his colleagues procured for their company another charter February 10, 1849.²⁰ This granted all the privileges of the former charter, such as the use of the remains of old state surveys, gradings and embankments, and a right of way two hundred feet wide from Cairo to Galena. But in addition to this, the new charter included a surrender to the company of all lands that might at any time be granted by Congress to the state for the purpose or in aid of the construction of the Illinois Central Railroad.²¹ It gave the company thirty or forty years to build a road which would then be its private property.²² In the meantime there was no restriction placed on the use of these lands other than the condition that the company spend \$200,000 each year until the road was completed.²³ Even this condition was vague and ill-defined. It is needless to say that Holbrook had scored a major point, for it mattered not whether the old Preemption bill or the one proposed by Douglas was made a law.

It was a case of "tails, I win; heads, you lose."

17. Moses, p.573.

18. Sheahan, p.569.

19. Gates, p.29.

20. Brownson, p.27.

21. Ibid., p.27; Cutts, p.189.

22. Editorial in Illinois State Register, Oct. 18, 1849.

23. Brownson, p.27.

Douglas expressed astonishment that after his bill of January 20, 1848 had passed the Senate three to one and lost by only one vote in the House the Legislature should instruct the Illinois members of Congress to vote for the land grant to the state.²⁴ At this time he was determined that nothing should be left undone to prevent a private individual or company gaining control of the land grant. When the Legislature adjourned Douglas decided to make a trip to Springfield to examine the manuscripts of the Legislature before they were printed in order to satisfy himself regarding the activities of Holbrook and his several companies. He discovered the clause which conveyed to Holbrook's company the lands that might be granted by Congress to the state for railroad construction. In a speech given in Chicago Senator Douglas declared that he was not able to find a single representative who knew that such a law had passed unanimously, but that he had been informed that Senator Judd and Lieutenant-Governor McMurty had opposed it.²⁵ The Governor and the Secretary of State denied any knowledge of the clause and could offer no explanation for its being there.²⁶ He also announced that he attached no censure to the Legislature as he presumed it was stolen through at the last minute without being read, and remarked that it was phrased so delicately that the casual reader would not readily recognize the enormity of the gift for which it provided. Senator Douglas was greatly disturbed that the Legislature had paved the way for Mr. Holbrook to receive as much of the government land as had been given to all the soldiers of the Mexican war.²⁷

24. Editorial in Illinois State Register, Oct. 18, 1849.

25. Cutts, p.190; Illinois State Register, Oct. 18, 1849.

26. Cutts, p.190.

27. Extract from the speech of Senator Douglas in Illinois State Register, Oct. 18, 1849.

At the special session of the Legislature, Douglas delivered a speech at Representative Hall on October 23, 1849, in which he declared that a fraud had been perpetrated upon the Assembly during the preceding winter. Had the bill donating public lands to the state not been delayed it would have placed the whole matter of the central railroad in the hands of Holbrook and his associates, who gave no assurance that the road would ever be completed.²⁸ In a Chicago address he maintained that the honor of Illinois was at stake and that if this charter were not repealed he would be forced to expose the whole affair in the United States Senate, lest at some later date it might appear that he had been a party to the transaction.²⁹ The knowledge of this underhanded piece of business he no doubt knew would prevent a land grant to the state by Congress.

D.B. Holbrook was, of course, anxious for Douglas to renew his bill for a land grant in the 1849-1850 session, but the determined Senator from Illinois soon convinced him that his well laid plans had gone awry. It is said that Douglas showed him a bill which he was about to introduce, one that provided for a road to be started from a point on the Ohio entirely different from the one previously mentioned and to be laid along a new line. It included, as well, a condition "that it should not enure to any railroad company then in existence. Holbrook was quite overcome, for his fortunes lay in Cairo. To cut it off the proposed road meant disaster to the progress of the town and to his interests there. He begged the Senator to save Cairo³⁰ on the condition that Holbrook release the charter which he had received from

28. Davidson and Stuve, p.594.

29. Illinois State Register, Oct. 18, 1849.

30. Cutts, p.191.

the state of Illinois. Holbrook went to New York, and as president of the company executed a release to the Governor of Illinois on December 15, 1849.³¹ When a copy of it reached Douglas in Washington he deemed it invalid, and informed Holbrook so, pointing out to him that neither the president nor the directors of his company could legally make such a release, but that he as president must summon the stockholders to instruct the directors who in turn must instruct the president.³² Holbrook had too much at stake so he was practically forced to comply. He presented Senator Douglas with a satisfactory release which he forwarded to the Secretary of the State of Illinois with a request for a telegram for its receipt.³³ This no doubt was a wise safeguard because on January 22, 1851, the Illinois Republican, Belleville, published two letters written to the paper on January 9, and January 17, which indicated that a debate over the repeal of the Great Western Railroad Company's charter was then in progress in the Illinois Legislature. The letter of January 17 claimed that the repeal was passed, but that a motion to reconsider it had been voted. This, of course, was after the grant had been made to the state, but judging from the concentrated efforts of the Senator to obtain the land for the state rather than allow it to go to a private corporation he must have felt certain that no further trouble over the charter would ensue.

Senator Breese failed to be reelected in 1849. This was indicative of the ascending power of the northern and central sections over the southern. General James Shields, an advocate of the donation plan, was chosen as his successor in the Senate. This meant that the entire Illinois delegation in

31. Brownson, 27; Davidson and Stuve, p.575.

32. Cutts, 192; Davidson and Stuve, 575.

33. Cutts, p.192.

Congress favored a land grant to the state, but support was needed from other sections of the country as well. Here again a leader was needed, one who possessed the ingenuity to obtain the necessary support and the energy to follow all details through to completion. Stephen A. Douglas continued to be the champion of the cause, although after the Great Western Railroad Company had been induced to surrender its charter Senator Shields and also Representatives John A. McClernand, John Wentworth and William H. Bissell of Illinois pressed the land grant proposition in Congress.³⁴ Senator Douglas believed that as long as a demand for government aid to railway construction maintained a sectional character it could not be carried. He also recognized that Chicago held a strategic position looking toward the lake traffic in an easterly direction and toward the Gulf traffic of the south. Therefore he began to lay stress on a Chicago branch of the Illinois Central, an innovation not included in the early proposals for the road.³⁵ It has been said that the Chicago connection was not original with Douglas since some years before there had been mention made of building a road through eastern Illinois, then the most neglected area of the state. Political weakness prevented anything being done at the time, but as Chicago grew in importance this eastern branch gained favor with many local politicians, so Senator Douglas had no trouble in acquiring friends for his project.³⁶

Stephen A. Douglas had moved to Chicago in 1847 and there developed a

34. Cole, 38.

35. Ibid., 37; Johnson, Stephen A. Douglas, 169.

36. Gates, 33.

37. Ibid., 28.

37

sentiment that his interests in that section were largely personal. One cannot wholly disprove this conclusion, but how far should an individual be condemned for advancing his own interests if he is simultaneously benefiting rather than injuring the best interests of hundreds of others? It seems that instead of being censured in this respect he should be credited for his vision of the future greatness of Chicago. At the same time he was tactfully removing suspicion of sectionalism, for without the Chicago branch the enterprise would remain a local affair and Senator Douglas was aware that government aid would not be forthcoming without the support of the South and the East.³⁸ In a letter which Douglas wrote to Sydney Breese on January 20, 1851³⁹ he stated, "It was necessary that the road should connect with the lakes in order to impart nationality to the project and secure Northern and Eastern votes." In the same piece of correspondence he went on to explain that the old line from Galena to Cairo with both termini on the Mississippi was regarded as a sectional scheme to throw the whole trade upon the Gulf of Mexico at the expense of the cities on the lakes and Atlantic seaboard.

He cleverly drew upon the interests of the business men of Chicago, of shippers along the Great Lakes, and of eastern capitalists by depicting the central railroad as a trunk line joining the Atlantic with the Mississippi.⁴⁰ This, however, was only one of the schemes resorted to in order to obtain the necessary votes. The Senators and Representatives of Alabama and Mississippi had consistently opposed a land grant to the State of Illinois,⁴¹

38. Gates, 31; Brownson, 29.

39. Ackerman, 69.

40. Cole, 37.

41. Cutts, 193.

but the cooperation of the South was ultimately won by including in the Illinois Central bill a provision granting all the rights, privileges, and liabilities connected with the grant of public lands to Illinois to Alabama and Mississippi so that a road might be extended from the Ohio to Mobile.⁴²

Senator Douglas conferred with the officials of the Mobile railroad while on a visit to his children's plantation in Mississippi. Financial difficulties were harassing this road at the time, as Douglas proposed that the company procure a land grant from the Federal government by making such a request a part of the Illinois Central bill.⁴³ This suggestion met with the approval of the road's officials, and Douglas carefully pointed out that of course their State Legislatures must instruct their senators and representatives to vote for the measure in Congress. Back in Congress Senator Douglas tactfully guided the conduct of Senator King of Alabama until the desired amendment to the bill was formulated and accepted.⁴⁴

It has been said that Douglas also compromised on certain tariff measures in order to remove the opposition of certain New England and Pennsylvania Congressmen,⁴⁵ but records indicate that there is little support for the statement. During these years Douglas stood for the repeal of duties on railroad iron,⁴⁶ or for their suspension for a limited time. In 1855 he remained a low tariff advocate for he said, "I am for a reduction of the tariff to a strict revenue standard." This policy was contrary to the wishes of the Pennsylvania and other iron interests of the East, so there seems to be little evidence of compromise in this direction.

42. Davidson and Stuve, 572; Cole, 38.

43. Cutts, 193-197.

44. Ibid., 194-195.

45. Brownson, 29.

46. Pamphlet Record of Hon. Stephen A. Douglas on the Tariff, compiled from

Due to the decline of Galena's importance, Dubuque, Iowa, the home of Senator Jones, was made the western terminus, a move which also tended to widen the interests in the Illinois highway. The results of the final voting showed that Senator Douglas had won over almost twenty votes by his cleverly managed schemes.⁴⁷ The bill passed the Senate⁴⁸ by a vote of 26 to 14.⁴⁸ The greatest difficulties over this land grant had always arisen in the House, but here also, according to the Senator's own explanation⁴⁹ he, with the cooperation of Representatives Bissell, McClelland, Wentworth⁵⁰ and Harris of Illinois and Representative Ashmun of Massachusetts,⁵¹ forced it through on September 17, 1850 by a vote of 101 to 76. It was signed by President Fillmore three days later. According to Robert M. Douglas, son of the Senator, it was through the influence of his father that the lands were given to the Illinois Central Railroad on the condition that the road would be built and would forever pay seven per cent of its gross receipts in lieu of taxes on the original line.⁵²

The people and the press of Illinois hailed the passage of the bill with joyful demonstrations. Internal improvement bonds increased ten per cent on the New York market.⁵³ Ex-Senator Breese was perturbed over the lack of acknowledgment and appreciation tendered him as the originator and advocate of this important enterprise. Douglas pointed out to him⁵⁴ in his correspondence that although he did not openly oppose the donation plan, he continued at every opportune moment to advance his own proposal for a

preemption right for Holbrook's company. Certainly the whole credit for the
 46 (continued) official records of Congress for People's State Committee of Pa.

2, 3, 5.

47. Willia, 118.

48. Ibid., 118.

49. Cutts, 196-197.

50. Gates, 31.

passage of this bill does not belong to Stephen A. Douglas, but it is just as certainly true that the measure was carried through Congress largely through his persistent and persevering efforts. The support it received from others was brought about by his energy, enthusiasm, and tact, the result of which proved beneficial to the entire State of Illinois.

Senator Douglas did not approve of "State Policy" adopted by the State Legislature in 1849. He maintained that the great interest of Illinois was agricultural and that that interest should not be sacrificed for the lesser interests of various localities.⁵⁵ He visualized the development of the West as a whole and hence saw beyond the boundaries of Illinois. In 1851 he wrote a letter from Washington to Uri Manley of Coles, Illinois, in which he declared that if he were a legislator in that state he would give his aid in granting a charter for a road from Illinoistown to Terre Haute, and to Vincennes, or to any line, in fact, across the state if a considerable number of people seemed interested in it.⁵⁶ In spite of his urging, however, a charter was granted to only one road leading to St. Louis by the Legislature in 1851. In this respect Douglas could do little, but his sympathies lay with the opposing faction of "State Policy" which, if the statement of a Belleville paper⁵⁷ can be trusted was a fair sized group. It stated, "By this denial of justice, nearly a hundred and fifty thousand people of Illinois

51.(continued from p.31) Moses, Vol.II, 597.

52. " " " Clark E. Carr, Stephen A. Douglas, A.C.McClurg and Company, Chicago, 1908, 24.

53.(continued from p.31) Davidson and Stuve, 571.

54. " " " Ackerman, 71-86.

55. Moses, 567; Davidson and Stuve, 567.

56. Davidson and Stuve, 567.

57. Editorial in Illinois Republican, Belleville, Feb. 28, 1849.

are deprived of the means of conveying their produce to a market, and the greater portion of their surplus crops and the entire bulk of the great staple of the West, which is Indian corn, is left to be consumed or to perish upon the soil where it grows." Thus it seems that Douglas' great foresight enabled him to encourage what was most beneficial for his constituents on the whole, even though at the time he was out of harmony with a particular group.

After the opening of Chinese ports to our trade in 1843, the acquisition of Oregon, Texas, and the Southwest, and the discovery of gold in California, trade with the Pacific region and with the Far East became more and more attractive, and the construction of a trans-country railroad a real necessity. A great interest in such a project had developed by 1849.⁵⁸

Early in 1845 a railroad promoter, Asa Whitney, petitioned Congress for a grant of land sixty miles wide to be used in constructing a railroad from Lake Michigan to Puget Sound⁵⁹ with its eastern terminus at or near Milwaukee. This point to the north was selected because the public lands in that region had not yet been taken up.⁶⁰ By crossing Lake Michigan and meeting the Michigan Central at Detroit a connection with the East would be possible. No action on this memorial was taken at that session, but Whitney made a special appeal to Congress for his proposal, an appeal which Representative Douglas saw fit to answer in the form of an open letter printed as

an eight page pamphlet dated at Quincy, Illinois, October 15, 1845. In this

58. R.S. Cotterill, "The National Railroad Convention in St. Louis, 1849." in the Missouri Historical Review, XII, October 1917-July 1918, p.203.

59. Ibid., 203.

60. Frank Heywood Hodder, "The Railroad Background of the Kansas-Nebraska Act, The Mississippi Valley Historical Review, XII, June 1925-March 1926 p.5.

reply he criticized Whitney's proposal and named Chicago as the proper point for the eastern and western railroads to converge. He made two major criticisms. First, a road which depended upon crossing Lake Michigan would be closed for four months of the year. Second, the plan conferred too much power and too much land upon one man. His own plan which he proposed in this same letter consisted of the following suggestions:⁶¹

1. Organize the region from the Missouri river to the Rocky mountains as the Nebraska territory. At the last session of Congress he had proposed a bill to organize the area from the Rocky mountains to the Pacific ocean as the territory of Oregon.
2. Grant these territories alternate sections of public lands for the purpose of constructing a railroad to the Pacific.
3. Make similar grants to the border states so that branch roads may be built to connect with it.

This is indication enough that Douglas even before he became Senator, was interested in the Pacific railroad, and determined to make Chicago the terminus. Out of 284 members in Congress he was the only one sufficiently interested in Asa Whitney's plan to comment upon it. He entered the Senate in December 1847, and during the summer of 1848 a River and Harbor Convention in Chicago took up the discussion of a transcontinental railroad and it made public a circular printed in January which named Douglas as an influential advocate of the Buffalo and Mississippi road by way of Chicago to the mouth of the Rock river with the expectation that it would be extended across the Mississippi to Council Bluffs on the Missouri.⁶²

The Mexican War changed the transcontinental railway situation for it made possible a southern route to the Pacific, a possibility quickly taken

61. Ibid, 6

62. Ibid, 7

up by Southern interests which for some years had anticipated railroad communication with the West in order to bring commerce to the southern seaboard.⁶³

The gold rush also made the need for a transcontinental railway more urgently felt. Senator Douglas had not introduced his plan, because in the meantime Senator Breese had championed Whitney's plan, introduced his memorial, and secured from the Legislature of Illinois a resolution instructing the senators and representatives to support it.

In short, more and more interest in the enterprise was expressed. During 1849 two conventions were called, one at Memphis in the interest of the southern route, the other at St. Louis in the interest of a central or northern route.⁶⁴ The people of Chicago asked Senator Douglas to represent them at St. Louis, but before accepting he called a mass meeting and reviewed his pamphlet of 1845. This had included the proposal for a road from Chicago to Council Bluffs and then by way of the South Pass to San Francisco. After carefully explaining how he was blocked from presenting his own plan and forced to support Whitney's plan through the instructions of the Legislature, he stated that he would represent them at St. Louis if his audience would promise to support his repudiation of the Legislature's instructions. The promise was obtained and when the convention assembled on October 15, 1849, Stephen A. Douglas was chosen as its president.⁶⁵

Senator Benton of Missouri made an address favoring a central route, and Douglas replied in the evening in favor of the South Pass. Newspapers comments upon the latter's speech were so caustic that he resigned the presidency. Hodder claims that it is difficult to ascertain from the articles what

63. Ibid., 7-8

64. Ibid., 7

65. Ibid., 9.

he said that was so offensive. A letter written to and printed in the Illinois State Register⁶⁶ describes the Illinois Senator's speech as mild, gentlemanly, good natured, and humorous. He had disapproved of Missouri's request for a road from St. Louis to the frontier and thence to the Pacific especially because Missouri had not yet built a single mile for herself. After the insinuation of the press that he was put in the chair by the Missouri delegation in order to muzzle him Douglas resigned claiming that he preferred to be a simple delegate free to protect the interests of his constituents. The plan adopted by this convention contained two resolutions presented by the Honorable R.W. Thompson of Indiana and really embodying Douglas' plan.⁶⁷ It proposed that the government should provide a national road from the Mississippi Valley to the Pacific, the same to be accomplished by means of a trunk road with branches to St. Louis, Memphis, and Chicago.⁶⁸

This adopted plan gave Douglas a talking point. As a result he appeared before the State Legislature at Representative Hall in Springfield the evening of October 23, 1849. He apologized for differing with the opinions of the Legislature and sought to explain why he so heartily disapproved of Whitney's plan. A moment's unprejudiced consideration of his reasons, it seems, would result in the conclusion that they were reasonable and that he sought to secure what he deemed most advantageous to his constituency through making the enterprises as national in character as possible. He informed the Legislature that he found it difficult to follow instructions which tended to favor Milwaukee and Wisconsin rather than Chicago and Illinois, because he felt that they did not express the sentiments of his people. Furthermore

66. Editorial in Illinois State Register, October 22, 1849.
 67. Ibid., October 22, 1849.
 68. Ibid., October 22, 1849; Hodder, 9.

the bill which allowed Mr. Whitney to locate the terminus of this important road at whatever point he should designate on Lake Michigan or the Mississippi river gave him too much range within which to negotiate with towns for a bonus to secure the road. He argued that this project should not be started in any state but instead at a point on the Missouri River in the territory region, for it would then be purely national. Otherwise every state to the Atlantic would feel justified in asking government aid to extend the road through its territory. He asked what reason could be given for spending time and money from national funds to build a railroad within the limits of a state and that too upon the immediate banks of a stream which Col. Benton had told us was "the best steamboat river upon the face of the earth." He expressed the hope that the Legislature would be guided by the harmonious agreement of the St. Louis convention in formulating its instructions. ⁶⁹

The Memphis convention declared its support for the Gila route and refused any alliance with northern interests. The organization of New Mexico as a part of the Compromise of 1850 gave the southern route an advantage. While the Senate was debating the Pacific railroad bill, the House passed a bill for the organization of Nebraska. To Stephen A. Douglas this bill seemed of paramount importance to the realization of the Pacific railway but in spite of his efforts to get it through the Senate it was tabled on the last day of the session. ⁷⁰

The 1852-1853 session of Congress gave Arkansas a land grant and proposed several ideas for the Pacific railroad route. On February 5, 1853, the plan to connect Fulton, Missouri with Cairo was rushed through the Senate in the

69. Illinois State Register, Nov. 1, 1849.

70. Hodder, 12-13.

absence of a member who was urging another way. It was thought that Douglas might have used some influence in this direction for if the southern route to the Pacific were to be used, and at the time it appeared to have the best chance, it would be advantageous to connect it with Chicago via Cairo and the Illinois Central.⁷¹ That more than one railroad to the Pacific would ever be built was unthought of, and in 1854 Chicago did not have as much support to be the railroad center of the Middle West as did Cincinnati.⁷²

Another convention was held in Memphis in 1853 to gain support for a southern route to the Pacific, and when the 33rd Congress met in December 1853 President Pierce appointed General James Gadsden as minister to Mexico. One of Gadsden's missions was to secure from Mexico enough land south of the Gila river to provide for the construction of a railroad to the Pacific.⁷³ The treaty providing for the Gadsden purchase was signed December 30, 1853, and the way for the southern route seemed assured.

Senator Douglas was in a very difficult position. The interests of northern Illinois as well as his own interests were centered about the development of Chicago. In 1852 he had bought seventy acres of land in that city.⁷⁴ Southern Illinois interests were bound up in St. Louis as a terminal. If he promoted the interests of either section he was certain to lose favor with the other.

For the time being railroad legislation was retarded by the furore that was raised by the Kansas-Nebraska question. In the opinion of some the desire to procure a northern route to the Pacific rather than any deep-seated slavery conviction prompted Douglas in his efforts toward the division of

71. Ibid., 13.

72. Ibid., 14.

73. Ibid., 15.

74. Ibid., p. 11.

Nebraska. Two organized territories might mean at least an equal chance⁷⁵ between a central and a northern route. There seems to be no record, however, that Douglas ever used this explanation to defend his connection with the repeal of the Missouri Compromise.⁷⁶ But it does provide a plausible reason for his altering the bill which he had proposed on January 4, 1854, in order to allow for two territories. Through his "popular sovereignty" theory he may have hoped to gain the support of the South for his railroad to the West.

On January 9, 1855, Senator Douglas introduced a railroad bill which provided for three roads; one west from Texas; one from Missouri or Iowa; and a third from Minnesota.⁷⁷ In the House the bill was substituted and amended to provide for a single road west from Iowa or Missouri. It lost by one vote and was not taken up again. Hence, although Douglas did not accomplish his own purpose he blocked the southern road for the time being. The Pacific railroad bill was revived in some form or other from time to time, and Douglas continued to favor it. On April 17, 1858 he delivered a forceful speech in the Senate on behalf of the bill then under consideration. His own words best describe his attitude toward it. "Sir, I have examined this bill very carefully. I was a member of the committee that framed it, and I gave my cordial assent to the report. I am free to say that I think it is the best bill that has ever been reported to the Senate of the United States for the construction of a Pacific railroad."⁷⁸ This speech shows no

sectional jealousy unless toward St. Louis. The bill agreed to begin the

75. Johnson, Douglas, 239; Hodder, 16.

76. P. Orman Ray, The Repeal of the Missouri Compromise, Arthur H. Clark Company, Cleveland, 1909, 242.

77. Hodder, 17.

78. Carr, 243.

road on the Missouri and Douglas suggested several satisfactory sites, but St. Louis was not one of them. He believed the bill was fair because it fixed the termini, but left to the contractors and owners the responsibility of choosing the route and managing the construction. He appealed to the Senators to unite on the question and lay aside all thought of sectional advantages. If there could be but one route, he considered the central one most fair, "for," he said, "the north, by bending a little down south, can join it; and the south, by leaning a little to the north, can unite with it too; and our Southern friends ought to be able to bend and lean a little as well as to require us to bend and lean all the time, in order to join them."⁷⁹ He stressed the importance of the road from a commercial point of view as well as from an economic standpoint, but in spite of his urgent appeal the measure failed, and the Kansas struggle, the Dred Scott Decision, and the Civil War made any final agreement on a transcontinental route impossible during the lifetime of Stephen A. Douglas.

The foregoing account of Senator Douglas' efforts to promote railroads tends to prove rather conclusively that he was a true representative of his constituents in this respect. It may be that his interest in Chicago was based upon a personal motive but it cannot be truly said that his attitude toward the building of roads was sectional. He promoted their construction because he knew that by so doing he was promoting the development of the West, a part of which was his own state. He spared no energy in his attempts in Congress to secure the aid which seemed most advantageous for the state and its people. His opposition to large land grants being given to individ-

79. Ibid., 246.

uals without any assurance that they would be used to the best interests of the people is surely commendable. In short, the records indicate that in no way did Senator Douglas hinder or retard railroad development in his state or fail to promote plans that were beneficial to its general welfare.

CHAPTER III

DOUGLAS AND ILLINOIS ON RIVER AND HARBOR
IMPROVEMENT, AND DISPOSAL OF PUBLIC LANDS

Since commerce and travel were largely dependent upon water transportation before the advent of the railroad, river and harbor improvement was a necessity for prosperity in all states, but especially so in the growing West. When Stephen A. Douglas was sent to Congress as one of the Senators from Illinois, all parties in Chicago and throughout northern Illinois were seeking federal aid for this purpose.¹ A river and harbor convention held at Chicago in July 1847 declared that Congress had constitutional authority over internal improvements of a national character, and that the improvement of the Great Lakes, the Ohio, and the Mississippi was within its power. Numerous newspaper editorials indicated the widespread interest. One editor claimed that he published with pleasure the remarks of the Honorable Mr. Dickinson at the opening of the Fair of the American Institute at New York city.² That gentleman's sentiment was expressed as follows:

It is disgraceful to the country that the natural advantages of our great lakes and rivers remained unimproved and nothing can be more unjust than that the expenses of making the necessary improvements should fall upon the states in which they are to be made.

The Chicago Daily Journal, a Whig publication, watched with interest for any moves which Congress might make "in regard to this important measure of such vital interest to the whole West." It denounced the "Locofocoism"⁴

1. Cole, 20

2. Editorial in Weekly Chicago Democrat, Nov. 2, 1847.

3. Editorial in The Chicago Daily Journal, Jan. 11, 1848.

4. A term that signified belief in wars of conquest, territorial aggrandizement for extension of slavery, and executive infallibility.

in the state which had opposed the improvement of river and harbors through "blind adhesion" to the President in all his vetoes.⁵

Various other circumstances and occurrences of the late forties serve to convey to us some idea of the attention and interest shown in Illinois in regard to this topic. In June 1848⁶ Mr. Wentworth of Illinois presented in Congress a memorial offered by a Chicago convention in behalf of such improvements. The convention had included representatives from eighteen states, a proof that the interest was not a purely local one, and the unanimity with which the above mentioned memorial was adopted suggests that the question had attracted widespread attention.⁷ Mr. Lewis Cass was denounced

for the Presidency on account of his stand on appropriations for harbor and river improvements.⁸ Early in 1849 there were presented in the United States Senate resolutions from the Legislature of Illinois instructing the Senators to aid in the enactment of a law providing for the improvement of the navigation of the Mississippi and Illinois Rivers, and also the harbors of the northern lakes.⁹ Its inclusion in the presidential message of Millard

Filmore on December 2, 1851¹⁰ shows that it must have been an appealing subject to many. He urged Congress to improve the harbors of "our great lakes and seacoast," and he also requested that body to appropriate money to provide for unobstructed navigation of our large rivers. He said, "The whole Northwest appeals to you for relief, and I trust their appeal will receive due attention at your hands." A northwestern Illinois river convention was

5. President Polk

6. Globe, 30 Congress, 1 session, 852.

7. Ibid., 852.

8. Editorial in Chicago Daily Journal, June 29, 1848.

9. Globe, 30 Congress, 2 session, 409.

10. Executive Documents of Sen. of U.S., 32 Congress, 1 session, I, 17-18.

held at Peoria in November, 1851. It unanimously urged the national government to assume the expense of clearing away obstacles to navigation from the Illinois River.¹¹ A public meeting had been announced in Chicago¹² to appoint delegates to Peoria. The Journal declared that it was of such great interest to Chicago that Congress should be made to feel its influence as much as possible. Later the names of ninety-eight delegates who had gone to the convention were published.¹³

There seems to be ample evidence that in the northern part of Illinois public opinion was strong for river and harbor improvement at government expense. The same could not be said, however, about southern Illinois, for there the democratic principles of Andrew Jackson and the policies of President Polk were sustained as reasons for rejecting internal improvements at the expense of the Federal government.¹⁴ Here again Senator Douglas was called upon to make a decision that was bound to meet with disapproval in some section of his state. Douglas favored river and harbor improvement for the same reason that he promoted railroad construction - the material welfare of the West. Even in his earliest years in the Senate he supported measures which aimed to procure federal appropriations for such improvements.

Stephen A. Douglas was as ardent an admirer and as sincere a defender of Andrew Jackson as there was to be found in Illinois. Yet he maintained that the great Democrat's principles would not be violated by an appropriation for the improvement of the Illinois River.¹⁵ It was, he said, a general

11. Cole, 30.

12. Chicago Daily Journal, Nov. 15, 1851

13. Nov. 19, 1851.

14. Cole, 31; Globe, 32 Congress, 1 session, Appendix, 1014.

15. Cole, 31.

system of internal improvements which Jackson vetoed, a system of canals and roads entirely apart from the navigation interest. He claimed that President Jackson in his veto of the Maysville Road bill expressed his conviction that Congress did not have the power to carry on the construction of roads and canals, but that he did not include improvements of interest to navigation. Before the Senate Douglas quoted from memory the words of Jackson on this subject.

But there is another class of works which may not be improperly called internal improvements which stands upon an entirely different footing; I allude (he says) to appropriations for the improvement of the channels in our navigable rivers, and for harbors, buoys, and beacons, and other works for the protection of navigation. These appropriations (he says) have been made from the foundation of the Government, and it is not my purpose to disturb that policy.¹⁶

By 1852 it was apparent that Senator Douglas had concluded that dependence upon Federal aid for local improvements was an unsatisfactory method of solving the problem. A River and Harbor Bill was under consideration in the Senate that year. He supported it,¹⁷ but it is evident that in his estimation the bill did not promise to meet the requirements of his state, for he suggested an addition which would allow the state a special privilege whereby it might care for its own rivers and harbors. In the Senate on August 21, 1852 he declared that the Illinois River was a deep straight stream, excellent for transportation with the exception that bars formed across its channel.¹⁸ If the State of Illinois had the authority to

16. Globe, 32 Congress, 1 session, Appendix, 1014.

17. Cole, 31.

18. Globe, 32 Congress, 1 session, Appendix, 1018.

levy tonnage duties, he pointed out, it would never have considered asking for an appropriation, but that since that authority was withheld by Congress the Illinois River was on the same footing as the Mississippi, a stream that was a public highway and not within the jurisdiction of the state. Therefore Douglas saw no grounds for objections to an appropriation being granted for its improvement.¹⁹

At the same time the improvement of the harbor at Waukegan was under discussion in the Senate. Douglas urged that it be cared for. He said, "It is a place where you must have a harbor of refuge, to prevent vessels going ashore at the head of the lakes." He thought \$47,000 would complete the breakwater, and he insisted that no harbor between Waukegan and Buffalo could have any better claim to government funds.

Numerous small appropriations were being requested and granted to carry on surveys for anticipated projects throughout the country. Senator Douglas criticised this policy because each survey put the project in line for a larger appropriation the next year. There being so many of these requests, each appropriation was sufficient to complete only a small portion of the project, and this small portion was frequently demolished by storms before anything further could be done toward its completion. This he considered a real waste, but his opposition here should not be construed as hostility toward harbor improvements. He urged the improvement of the harbors all along the coast of the State of Michigan for the benefit of lake commerce in general. His attitude at this point toward the policy that was being followed and toward the welfare of his constituency is best expressed in his own

19. Globe, 32 Congress, 1 session, 1018

20. Globe, 32 Congress, 1 session, 998.

words spoken in the Senate.

But, sir, while I am anxious to see whether we cannot get a better system than this, or rather, whether we cannot adopt a system of harbor improvement which will be effectual; yet, until that should be adopted, I must adhere to the present, in order to put a stop as far as possible, to the frightful and appalling destruction of life and property, that we find now happening upon the western waters, and the northern lakes, and upon our coast almost every day; and when we are going on with this bill, I do feel under an obligation, when seven or eight objects are specified in it for small appropriations for surveys with reference to future expenditures, to insist that we extend these surveys to points in which my constituents are vitally interested, or else, that we make an appropriation for a survey in general terms, so that, at least, we shall have a chance to have our coast examined, as well as these other objects.²⁰

Whether or not we agree with Senator Douglas' plan we must commend him for endeavoring to provide an "effectual" system of harbor improvement with which to replace what he considered an ineffectual one. On August 23, 1852 he offered in the form of an amendment the solution he had formerly suggested.²¹ He emphasized the fact that he was not offering it as a substitute for the bill under consideration, but as an addition. The system, which he considered would be "general, uniform and effectual," was contained and described in

22

three sections:

1. According to the Constitution, Congress could grant to the states the privilege to lay tonnage duties.²³ If Congress would do this the states might then authorize local authorities of places located on the Atlantic or Pacific coast, the Gulf of Mexico, the bank of any bay or arm of a sea or lake, the shores of Lake Champlain, Lake St. Clair, or the Great Lakes to levy duties of tonnage not to exceed ten per cent on boats and vessels of all descriptions which entered harbors or waters within the limits of said local authorities. The funds received from these duties would

21. Globe, 32 Congress, 1 session, Appendix, 1127-1128.

22. Globe, 32 Congress, 1 session, Appendix, 1027

23. Article I, sec. 10.

be used exclusively for "constructing, enlarging, deepening, improving and securing safe and commodious harbors and entrances thereto at such cities and towns." These duties should never exceed the actual needs.

2. If several states bordered upon a lake or other body of water they might enter into an agreement to apply a portion of the duties raised in each city to make safe the navigation of any lakes, rivers or channels connecting them. In the case of canals or artificial channels only such tolls should be collected as were necessary to keep them in repair.
3. In the case of navigable water situated wholly or in part within a state's limits, the State Legislature might collect tonnage duties on all vessels using it in order to improve and keep it in repair. Where navigable streams formed boundaries the states might by joint action or agreement provide for the collection of sufficient tonnage duties to care for the improvement of that body of water.

Douglas ardently defended his system before the Senate. He cited several cases where the consent of Congress had been given to levy tonnage duties. Between 1805 and 1809 the privilege had been granted to Baltimore, Philadelphia, Charleston, and ports of Georgia. As late as 1843 and 1850 consent had been given to Baltimore.²⁴ A great deal of discussion both for⁺ and against the Illinois Senator's plan followed his proposal. He finally offered to withdraw his amendment in order that consideration of the bill itself might proceed more rapidly. This would seem to indicate that he desired to avoid placing any obstacle in the way of a River and Harbor bill. Objections to the withdrawal of Douglas' amendment were raised, but the chair finally ruled that such procedure was in order. However, Senator Atchinson of Missouri renewed the amendment and a vote upon its acceptance²⁵ was ordered. The result was 25 nays to 17 yeas.

River and Harbor bills continued to be introduced and Senator Douglas

24. Globe, 32 Congress, 1 session, Appendix, 1129.

25. Globe, 32 Congress, 1 session, Appendix, 1142-1146.

continued to defend his plan. With him it was a case of expediency²⁶ as to whether the National or the State government should control the system and not a matter for "quibbling about partisan politics." State control, he thought, was by far the better plan. In 1852, he declared in the Senate "I never knew a harbor undertaken by the Government completed. If the Senator can show me one harbor on the continent which has been completed, he will show me an object which I have never seen or heard of."²⁶ And in a letter²⁷ written in 1854 to Governor Matteson of Illinois he stated, "when- ever appropriations have been proposed for river and harbor improvements, and especially on the Northern lakes and the Western rivers, there has usually been a death struggle and a doubtful issue. We have generally succeeded with an appropriation once in four or five years, in other words, we have upon an average been beaten about four times out of five in one house of Congress or the other, or both, or by the Presidential veto." On the whole, to look further for Federal aid toward internal improvements was to him very unsatisfactory. The framers of the Constitution, he was certain, had contemplated State control when they incorporated the clause referring to tonnage duties.²⁸ He also favored such a system because it would remove rivers and harbors from the field of politics. Each town or city would be interested in its own harbor, and the possibility that the power would be abused was slight, since the money could be used for no other purpose, and no town would neglect its harbor, or impose duties higher than necessary for fear of driving commerce to a rival port.²⁹ Apparently thinking of his own

26. Globe, 32 Congress, 1 session, Appendix, 999.

27. Letter to Governor Matteson, Jan. 2, 1854. Clark E. Carr, Stephen A. Douglas, A.C. McClurg and Co., Chicago, 1909, 236.

28. Ibid., 238.

29. Ibid., 238.

state and perhaps the entire West as well, he questioned the fairness of granting federal aid to those who resided on salt water while denying it to those on the shores of fresh water bodies.³⁰

31

The Democratic papers regarded Senator Douglas' idea as an effective one, but the Whig press felt that he would have to go personally to every county in the state in order to reconcile the people to the doctrine that the producers of the West must pay for all repairs to harbors and rivers in order to accomodate the eastern manufacturers and merchants.³²

The Whigs described this proposal as a very harmful measure for the agricultural consumer, and they were certain that the motive behind such an idea was the desire of Douglas to attain the Presidency.³³

In his letter to Governor Matteson Douglas had indicated that the plan was not unfair to the agricultural consumer. He had pointed out that canal tolls and railroad charges were in reality taxes on commerce, yet no one complained particularly about them. He had recalled a fact which has been difficult to comprehend in many instances in all periods of history. "No matter," he wrote, "who is intrusted with the construction of the works, somebody must foot the bill."³⁴

If the Federal government built railroads and canals and made river and harbor improvements the increased expenditure would call for an increased tax on commerce. This being true, and it having been proven that public works could be constructed more economically by private enterprise than by the Federal government Douglas assured the governor of his state that it was by far the better plan for the state to take up the matter and pay for these projects by levying tonnage duties.³⁵

30. Ibid., 235.

31. The Daily Democratic Press and Chicago Democrat

32. Chicago Daily Journal, Jan. 18, 1854.

Senator Douglas voted against the River and Harbor bill of 1854³⁶ because he felt that the appropriations provided therein for the Illinois and Iowa rivers and harbors were so small that they would scarcely begin the necessary improvements. He spoke at length concerning the amount of money that was wasted by these small appropriations. They provided for mere beginnings which were practically destroyed by winds and currents before further appropriations could be obtained with which to complete the projects.³⁶ Sensible as his argument was, criticism was his lot. The Democratic Press³⁷ which had been supporting him wrote, "When Mr. Douglas represented the Bounty Tract in Congress and wanted to make favor in that region he was a River and Harbor man, and wrote letters in favor of an appropriation of \$200,000 to improve the Illinois River. Now that he is electioneering upon a larger scale, and wants Southern votes he is against River and Harbor improvements altogether." Records do not show that he was ever against these measures unless in certain parts that did not come up to his ideas of fairness. The same paper also stated, "The 'Tonnage Duties' were all the go with Mr. Douglas for a time, but tonnage duties, like his other duties, have been abandoned and neglected to catch presidential votes." His consistent manifestation of keen interest in the growing West was entirely ignored.

Yet in 1856 we find the Senator supporting the same plan providing for tonnage duties. A bill for continuing the improvement of the Chicago harbor was under discussion during the summer of that year. Douglas maintained

33. (continued from p.50) Ibid., Jan. 27, 1854.

34. (" " " Letter to Gov. Matteson, 241.

35. (" " ") Ibid., 241.

36. Globe, 32 Congress, 1 session, 998.

37. The Democratic Press, September 28, 1854.

that it was useless to argue over whether or not these improvements should be continued. Bars would continue to form and repairs and improvements would continue to be necessary. "I have said frequently that this improvement of rivers and harbors will never end; and the only question is, as to the plan we shall adopt," was his reasonable conclusion to the problem at hand.³⁸

As sincerely as Senator Douglas brought forward his plan, and as ardently as he endeavored to win for it support, it was forced into the background by the increasing interest in the slavery issue. Nevertheless, his record in the Senate conveys the impression that he was a sincere advocate of river and harbor improvements. He apparently saw no objection to Federal aid for this purpose, but when that system failed to secure the desired results he sought to establish one which he felt would benefit the navigation interests of his state and of the entire West. In short, his primary interest was the improvement of rivers and harbors rather than the method by which it should be secured.

Another problem of vital importance at this time to the people of Illinois and, in fact, to the inhabitants of the entire West arose over the disposal of the public lands. With the exception of certain grants made by foreign sovereigns before 1783 all of Illinois was "public domain,"³⁹ and was surveyed and disposed of by the United States. In connection with this, there developed two plans which became known as the homestead policy and the preemption policy. The reader will recall that by the land act of 1785 the lands of the West could be bought at the state capitals in 640

38. Globe, 34 Congress, 1 session, 1941.

39. Thomas Donaldson, The Public Domain, Government Printing Office, Washington, 1884, 426.

acre lots at not less than a dollar an acre. In 1800 land offices were established near the lands to be sold, and the minimum amount that could be purchased at one time was reduced to 160 acres, but the minimum price was increased to two dollars an acre. Payments, however, could be made in four installments. The scarcity of money made even this arrangement difficult, so in 1820 the price was reduced to a dollar and a quarter an acre, but cash payment was required. Even at this lowered price settlers found it impossible to save enough to acquire and improve a farm. Consequently the Westerners arrived at the conclusion that the government should grant the land to the settlers for only the cost of surveying it. This idea became known as the "homestead policy."

The Easterners had helped to purchase much of this land from the Indians and hence, objected to its being given away to others. The result was that many Westerners without government provision or permission moved into the unsurveyed regions and established homes. This was all very well until the government actually opened these areas for sale; dissension arose, for buyers gladly chose the improved pieces, and the settlers who had done the pioneering were forced to move out. This condition prompted the passage of a Preemption Act which gave actual settlers an option on the land at a dollar and a quarter an acre before it was put up at auction to the public.⁴⁰ It was passed in 1830 for one year, but it was extended from year to year until it was made permanent in 1841.⁴¹ The western farmers

appreciated this assurance, but they continued to demand a homestead law;

40. Carl Russell Fish, History of America, American Book Company, Chicago, 1925, 242-243.

41. Ibid., 243; John Bell Sanborn, Congressional Grants of Land in Aid of Railways, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1899, 10.

and as land grants began to be given by the Federal government to states for internal improvements, the settlers on these lands became interested in protection for their preemption rights.

Such were the conditions when Stephen A. Douglas entered the United States Senate. His support of a liberal policy in the management of the public lands was in keeping with the consideration he accorded the rights and interests of the western farmers in other respects. Members of the Illinois delegation in both houses of Congress were kept busy during the late forties and early fifties presenting memorials from Illinois citizens who were urging the passage of a homestead law.⁴²

Late in 1849 and early in 1850 Senator Douglas introduced and defended a Homestead bill which provided for the head of a family, male or female, to receive 160 acres of land from the government providing he or she would reside upon it and cultivate a portion of it for a period of four years.⁴³ He rejoiced that Senator Webster of Massachusetts and Senator Houston of Texas had introduced similar requests.⁴⁴ A quotation or two from his speech delivered in the Senate in defense of his proposed Homestead bill will best serve to express his straightforward and unprejudiced sentiments on this question:

I introduced that bill (he declared) believing that it embraced the true principle upon which the public lands should be disposed of; believing that the justice of it would commend itself to the approbation of the people of every portion of the country; believing that the man who goes into the wilderness, and makes the first settlement, who erects his house, who makes his improvements, who undergoes the privation to which

42. Globe, 30 Congress, 1 session, 526; 30 Congress, 2 session, 409; Cole, 90.

43. Sheahan, 527; Letter to Mayor Woodworth of Chicago from Douglas, March, 28, 1850, Illinois Republican

44. Globe, 31 Congress, 1 session, 264.

pioneers are subject is entitled to the preference over him who purchases the land for purposes of speculation and waits for the price to rise to make his fortune from those who are to come after him.⁴⁵

Senator Seward of New York had proposed a resolution whereby preference in land grants would be given to foreigners, who, he said, were forced by injustices and oppression to leave their native land. Douglas, in defense of his own policy, replied as follows:

I believe, sir, that that (Douglas' plan) is the true principle on which the public lands should be disposed of - a principle which is of as much importance to the South as it is to the North, to one portion of the new State as to another - when the recently acquired territory is to be disposed of; and, sir, I drew that bill with reference to liberality of action upon the question, so far as foreigners and emigrants were concerned, in order that both the foreigner and the emigrant should be put upon an equal footing with citizens of the United States.⁴⁶

He vigorously condemned the practice of favoring the foreigner that was being carried on in some sections, but he also maintained that the emigrant should not be denied the same privileges granted to the citizens. "The true policy," he said, "is to do neither. Receive the emigrant settler on an equality with the American citizen, and make no discrimination for or against either."⁴⁷

There were some who believed that those who would benefit by the proposed Homestead policy would be required to pay no taxes. Douglas denied such a possibility. Both native and foreigner, he assured the Senate, would pay taxes and thereby help to build up the country and to reduce the burden of taxation upon the other citizens of the United States.⁴⁸

45. Globe, 31 Congress, 1 session, 264.

46. Ibid., 263.

47. Ibid., 266.

48. Ibid., 266.

Again Senator Douglas was accused of advocating a policy that was largely a vote-catching proposition. The exact motives behind Douglas' proposal, of course, can not be ascertained, but it was a measure heartily desired by the Westerners. Douglas himself pointed out that Webster's proposal included widows, and his own mentioned females as well as males.⁴⁹

In connection with public land grants, late in 1850 the Senate took up the consideration of a bill to grant bounty land to certain officers and soldiers who were in the military service of the United States. The bill granted one hundred sixty acres for twelve months of service; eighty acres for six months; and forty acres for three months.⁵⁰ Senator Shields of Illinois drew attention to the fact that many, through no fault of their own, never served a full term, and Senator Bell hoped that an amendment would also provide for those who were called for only sixty days. After some debate upon the subject had taken place Senator Douglas announced that while he found it difficult to put the desired amendment into a satisfactory form, he had prepared one that approximated his idea. It read:

That those who engaged to serve for a period of twelve months or more, and who actually served nine months, shall receive one hundred and sixty acres; those who engaged to serve for a period of six months or more, and served four months, shall receive eighty acres; and those who engaged to serve for any or an indefinite period, and served one month, shall receive forty acres.⁵¹

When Senator Davis of Mississippi suggested that some provision be made for those discharged on account of wounds or diseases prior to the expiration of their term of service, Senator Douglas willingly agreed,

49. Ibid., 265.

50. Ibid., 1732.

51. Ibid., 1733.

remarking "Two regiments from my own State, who fought at Buena Vista, were discharged about ten days before the expiration of their term of service." He immediately moved to add a proviso which would care for the disabled soldier who was honorably discharged.⁵²

The desire for a Homestead law became more widespread. In 1851 the General Assembly of Illinois passed a joint resolution urging Congress to enact a Homestead law. On October 13, 1851, a land reform convention was held at Chicago for the same purpose. The demand of the settlers was incessant and constant until by 1852 the proposition of granting the public lands to settlers became a national question and a source of political controversy

from 1854 to 1862.⁵³ The Free Soil Democracy in its National Convention at Pittsburgh on August 11, 1852 adopted as a plank in its platform the

following resolution:⁵⁴

That the public lands of the United States belong to the people, and should not be sold to individuals nor granted to corporations, but should be held as a sacred trust for the benefit of the people and should be granted in limited quantities, free of cost to landless settlers.

With all these sentiments concerning the "public domain" Stephen A. Douglas seemed to be in perfect accord. His Homestead policy was never carried out during his lifetime, but the law passed shortly after his death was very similar to his proposals.

The Senator's interest in the Chicago region was frequently labeled a personal one. It is true that his land holdings were rather large. In 1849 he purchased about eighty acres fronting on Lake Michigan south of the city

52. Globe, 31 Congress, 1 session, 1744.

53. Donaldson, 332.

54. Ibid., 332.

limits of that day, between what is now 33rd and 35th streets. While he was general counsel for the Illinois Central Railroad he received in part as his compensation deeds to large tracts of land in the Lake Calumet region, which was often jokingly referred to as "the frog pond of Mr. Douglas."⁵⁵

At the time of his death he held by contracts nearly five thousand acres of land in Cook county all within an average area of fifteen miles from Chicago.⁵⁶ It would be difficult to say just what his intentions were, but it has been said⁵⁷ that when he was chairman of the Committee of Territories he refused to speculate in land in the new states and territories although the opportunity was at hand. He spent lavishly toward the aid of his party in Illinois during the campaigns of 1856 and 1858,⁵⁸ and he showed a philanthropic interest in Chicago and in higher education by his efforts to found a local university. Here again he was accused of a desire for personal gain; namely, the benefit it would bring to his extensive properties in that vicinity.

His attitude throughout the transaction does not indicate that he was prompted by such a motive. Upon his return to Chicago after the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska bill a banquet in his honor was given by a group of his friends at the Tremont House. It is told that at this gathering he mentioned a desire to promote the founding of a university for Chicago. Present at the time was Charles Walker, one of his friends, and a prominent Baptist citizen. Through Walker's encouragement Dr. John C. Burroughs, the pastor of the First Baptist Church of Chicago traveled to Washington in March, 1856

55. Thomas Wakefield Goodspeed, The University of Chicago Biographical Sketches, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1925, II, 11.

56. N.P. Iglehart, History of the Douglas Estate in Chicago, Steam Press of H.A. Newcombe and Co., Chicago, 1869, p. 237.

57. Johnson, Douglas, p. 310.

to see Senator Douglas about plans for the founding of a university.⁵⁹ The result was a contract drawn up in the city of Washington on April 2, 1856. Senator Douglas agreed to give to Dr. Burroughs a nearly square plot of ground containing approximately ten acres on the condition that the latter procure the organization of a Board of Trustees for a university according to the statutes of the State of Illinois, and erect a building for which not less than \$100,000 should be raised and expended within five years.⁶⁰ The location of the site was on the south side at Cottage Grove Avenue and Thirty-fourth Street, a location then very much in the country. Horse cars ran on Cottage Grove Avenue only as far south as Thirty-first Street. Senator Douglas' home was located across the Avenue from the university site, but only a very few buildings stood in the vicinity. The country all about was covered with oak trees.⁶¹

On July 4, 1857, a little more than a year after the contract was signed, the corner-stone of the university building was laid, but the Senator's unpopularity at the time, because of the hostility felt toward the Kansas-Nebraska Act, reflected upon the university and made the collection of funds next to impossible. Because of this situation Douglas deeded the site in 1858 without any conditions,⁶² and as criticism of him grew more severe he offered to refund all the money expended on the site donated by him up to that time, and to donate \$50,000 toward the establishment of a university on any site the trustees should choose. He expressed his regrets that his enemies had gone so far as to assail the University itself, and to

58. (continued from p. 58)Goodspeed, II; Iglehart, 136.

59. Goodspeed, II, 17.

60. Ibid., 5-6.

61. Ibid., I, 320.

62. Ibid., II, 3.

incite influence against it because he had donated the site, but the trustees showed their faith in him by unanimously declining his offer, and by making him President of the Board of Trustees, which position he held for five years.⁶³

The University organized by means of the aid of Stephen A. Douglas closed its doors in 1866 because of the constantly increasing burden of debt. The present University was organized under a new charter, and under a new Board of Trustees appointed by the American Baptist Educational Society. It is an entirely new and different institution, located on a new and different site, and it graduated its first class in 1893. The first university changed its name to "The Old University" so that the new one might be incorporated under the title it had used, "The University of Chicago." The newly organized institution invited the graduates of "The Old University" to become alumni, and to cooperate in establishing its fame.⁶⁴

Even though the present University of Chicago is an entirely different organization from the one established in Douglas' time the Illinois Senator when he donated the site of the first University was in reality laying the foundation of the great institution of the present. There is a bronze tablet showing a bust of Stephen A. Douglas on the wall of the cloister of the Mitchell Tower group of buildings at the University of Chicago. Below it is the following inscription.

In honor of Stephen A. Douglas, who, in 1855, generously contributed to the founding of the first University of Chicago established in Chicago, this tablet is erected in June, 1901, by the Decennial Class of the University of Chicago.⁶⁵

The present University received from one of the last officials of that first University the original contract for a deed of the site and also the original deed which are carefully guarded as valuable historical papers. After the death of Senator Douglas his connection with the University became one of its "enduring glories,"⁶⁶ and surely no more imposing monument has ever been raised to any man.

63. (continued from p.60) Ibid., 18.

64. " " " Ibid., 3

65. " " " Ibid., 1.

66. Ibid., 1.

CHAPTER IV

DOUGLAS AND THE SLAVERY ISSUE IN ILLINOIS BEFORE 1854

The geographical position of Illinois tended to develop among its early settlers adverse sentiments concerning the slavery question. Early immigrants from Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and North Carolina had reached the state by way of the Ohio, Cumberland, and Tennessee rivers.¹ Two slave states touched its southern boundary. Then, too, the Indian possessions in the northern area together with the absence of navigable waterways between the East and the West enhanced the interests and strengthened the connections that quite naturally drew these settlers Gulfward.² Although some of these immigrants were averse to the introduction of slavery into the state they were southern enough in character to remain hostile to anti-slavery doctrines.³

On the other hand the northern areas were populated chiefly by settlers from the abolition states who had been attracted to that region after the passing of the Indian and upon the completion of the Illinois-Michigan canal. Naturally they brought with them a substantial amount of abolitionist feeling and many free-soil principles. Had Illinois been admitted to the Union with its northern boundary extended west from the northern boundary of Indiana as had been first suggested it is very probable that it would have become a slave state. It has been said that, "but for the northern tiers of counties Illinois might have been carried out of the Union and with it

1. Johnson, Douglas, 151; Robert W. Patterson, Early Society in Southern Illinois, Fergus Historical Series 11-15, Fergus Printing Co. Chicago, 1880 No. 14, 118.

Kentucky and Missouri.⁴ However, the northern boundary was located⁴ at 42°30', and Illinois became a link between the gulf plains and the lake and prairie regions,⁵ a fact which virtually forced its statesmen to adopt a spirit of compromise.

Before Illinois became a state many restrictions had been placed upon the negroes within the territory, but despite this fact their numbers had increased. In 1800 there were about one hundred thirty-five negroes in the territory, but by 1820 the number within the state had increased to seven hundred forty-nine.⁶ These early restrictions later became known as the "Black Codes." They appeared in the State Constitution of 1818, the Statutes at Large of 1818-1819, and the Constitution of 1848.⁷ It is also interesting to note that these were not repealed until February 7, 1865.⁸

When Illinois applied for admission as a state the question of slavery seemed to be a vital one, and considerable uncertainty existed as to whether or not Congress would admit Illinois with the Constitution of 1818. There arose in the House some opposition based upon the belief that the Constitution was not conclusive enough in its rejection of slavery. Other members, however, maintained that the Ordinance of 1789 had no reference to slaves already held in the Northwest Territory, and that Illinois should not be refused admission upon such a technicality. The bill passed in the House by a large majority and the Senate approved it without discussion. Thus Congress showed its approval of the theory that the Ordinance of 1789 did

2. (continued from p.61) Johnson, Douglas, 151.

3. " " Patterson, 118.

4. Ibid., 119.

5. Johnson, Douglas, 152.

6. N.Dwight Harris, The History of Negro Servitude in Illinois and the Slavery Agitation in that State, 1719-1864, A.C.McClurg And Company, Chicago, 1904, 10.

7. Ibid., 10; Johnson "Illinois as a Constituency", 405.

not apply to negroes held as slaves in the Northwest Territory before that year, and the state was admitted with the right to retain negroes as "indentured servants."⁹ Harris claimed, "Before 1840 and for several years after, the negro had no legal status in Illinois. He was an ostracized individual existing, by the sufferance of the people of Illinois, without citizenship and without social recognition." Previous to the Civil War free negroes in Illinois were not allowed to vote, sue for liberty in the courts or serve in the militia. In fact they could not reside within the state without a certificate of freedom obtained at some County Commissioner's Court and without posting a bond of \$1000 in assurance that they would never become county charges.¹⁰ Up to 1836 the Illinois Supreme Court protected the indenture system, but, reflecting public opinion, it tended to destroy the system between 1836 and 1845. After 1845 the Court's judgments were all on the anti-slavery side.¹¹ Politicians, mostly southern in sympathy, urged the calling of a convention in 1824 to draw up a new constitution that would provide for the "normal existence of slavery."¹²

Hence we see that previous to the 1840's the anti-slavery element in Illinois was rather negligible, but during that decade the force of "Yankee" ideals and policies began to develop. Central Illinois, which included the territory about Quincy, Springfield, and Champaign, represented a combination of the traditions, like and dislikes of the two extreme sections of the

8. (continued from p.63) Harris, 10.

9. Ibid., 24-26.

10. Ibid., 226.

11. Ibid., 110-117; 121-122.

12. Patterson, 118.

state.¹³ The development of the anti-slavery movement in Illinois during the early forties was very noticeable. The first abolition vote in Illinois was cast in 1840 at which time James G. Birney, the national Liberty candidate for President, received one hundred sixty votes. This vote represented twenty-two counties out of eighty-eight, and only twenty-two votes out of the one hundred sixty came from south of Springfield. An anti-slavery convention was held at Galesburg in 1841, and an anti-slavery newspaper, the Western Citizen, was established in Chicago in 1842. Aurora held a Liberty State Convention in 1844, and during that same year Chicago elected one alderman from the Liberty party. In November 1844, 3469 votes were cast in Illinois for that party's candidate for President.¹⁴

By 1847 it was clearly evident that the abolitionists were asserting themselves throughout the state. They held a southern Illinois Liberty Convention at Eden on October 6, 1847 where a committee of ten was appointed to agitate the question in preparation for the campaign of 1848. They expressed disapproval over the proposed Constitution of 1848 because it restricted citizenship to white persons. About the same time a Chicago Liberty Convention endorsed the opposition to discrimination against the negro, to the Mexican War, and to the acquisition of Texas. It also advocated the repeal of the Illinois "Black Laws." After peace was signed with Mexico in February, 1848 a widespread interest was manifested as to whether or not slavery would be extended into the newly acquired territory. A strong feeling against its extension developed within all parties.¹⁵

13. George Fort Milton, The Eve of Conflict, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston and New York, 1934, p.316-317.

14. Harris, 146-155.

15. Ibid., 161-162.

During the summer of 1848 a convention of abolitionists met at Buffalo and created a Union or Free Soil Party. It adopted a platform, and nominated Martin Van Buren and John Quincy Adams. The Chicago Tribune, a daily Free Soil paper, had been established July 10, 1847, and now the Chicago Free Soil League ratified the platform and nominations of the new Free Soil Party.¹⁶

The Whigs throughout the state opposed the extension of slavery. Hence they fell in line also with the newly established party, thus making two anti-slavery groups in Illinois. The newer one, however, was more moderate than the old Liberty Party.¹⁷ Van Buren received 15,702 votes in Illinois, a gain of 12,233 for the Free Soil group since 1844.

However, no gains were made in the local elections, and hard times, financial difficulties and lack of leaders weakened the abolitionists' control.¹⁸

The Whig and Democratic parties were both well developed in Illinois at this time. The latter was greater in numbers, better disciplined, and more efficient, and it had controlled all the general elections in the state since 1818.¹⁹

Of this influential party Stephen Arnold Douglas was becoming the undisputed leader. He had grown to manhood in a Democratic community, and he had identified himself with the New Englander who had moved to Illinois. Nevertheless, his personal life enabled him to acquire a sympathetic understanding of southern ways and of the social order that was based upon the slave system. Upon entering Congress the "Little Giant" made the acquaintance of David S. Reid, a young lawyer from North Carolina. The two became close friends and Douglas was often invited to partake of the hospitality

16. Ibid., 167-169.

17. Ibid., 171.

18. Ibid., 172-175. 19. Ibid., 156; Johnson, "Illinois as a Constituency", 408

of the Southland. Soon he had become acquainted with many of Mr. Reid's friends and relatives. Among these was Reid's cousin, Martha Denny Martin, the daughter of a North Carolina planter. She became the wife of Stephen Douglas on April 7, 1847, shortly after he had been chosen United States Senator from Illinois. Through his marriage and by his association with southern men and women he became familiar with plantation life, its feelings and its problems. This experience did not make him pro-southern nor a slavery advocate, but it did free him of the narrow viewpoint of many of his northern associates.

Colonel Martin, Mrs. Douglas' father, had invested in a plantation on the Pearl river in Mississippi where one hundred fifty negroes were engaged in raising cotton. Upon his death this property was left to Douglas' wife and their two sons. It furnished excellent material for the Senator's political enemies, and many were the jibes and insinuations that were hurled at him. Again and again he was accused of being a slaveholder. In a letter to the editor of the Illinois State Register Douglas explained his position briefly and clearly. "It is true," he wrote, "that my wife does own about 150 negroes in Mississippi on a cotton plantation. My father-in-law in his lifetime offered them to me and I refused to accept them. This fact is stated in his will, but I do not wish it brought to the public as the public have no business with my private affairs, and besides anybody would see that the information must have come from me. My wife has no negroes except those in Mississippi. We have other property in North Carolina, but no negroes. It is our intention, however, to remove all our property to Illinois as soon as possible."²¹

20. Johnson, Douglas, 147.

Briefly stated, the foregoing indicates the slavery background of Senator Douglas and of his constituency at the time he became United States Senator and entered into one of the greatest controversies in the nation's history. As the decade of the forties drew to a close Illinoisians watched the slavery issue with an ever growing interest. The northerners, largely free soil advocates, were agitated; the southerners, really favoring pro-slavery measures, sought to keep a middle path.²²

When the Mexican War began, many anticipated an acquisition of territory in the southwest and an extension of the compromise line of 1820. As if to counteract such an occurrence David Wilmot, a Pennsylvania Democrat offered, in August 1846, a proviso that would permanently exclude slavery from any territory which might be acquired from Mexico. In the House it won by six votes, but a deadlock in the Senate defeated the measure there. Douglas, then a member of the House, voted against it.²³

By 1848, the State Legislature of Illinois was controlled largely by the northern and central sections and it was safely Democratic;²⁴ yet during the regular winter session of 1849 Free Soilers and Whigs aided the Democrats of the northern section in passing an unexpected joint resolution.²⁵ Southern Democrats had voted against it, but they were in the minority.²⁶ On January 30, 1849, Douglas presented that resolution in the Senate.²⁷

It requested him and his fellow delegates "to procure the enactment of such

21. (continued from p.67) Ibid., 149. In a footnote Johnson states that this letter dated Aug. 3, 1850, was in the possession of Mrs. James W. Patton of Springfield, Ill. at the time he wrote Douglas' biography.

22. Cole, 64.

23. Bernard and Stuve, 635.

24. Ibid., 636; Willis, 105.

25. Willis, 106; Harris, 177;

26. Willis, 106.

27. Globe, 30 Congress, 2 session, XVIII, 394.

laws for the government of the territories acquired by the United States under the treaty with Mexico as shall expressly declare that there shall neither be slavery nor involuntary servitude in those territories unless for the punishment of crimes." Representative Douglas had voted against the Wilmot Proviso and Senator Douglas continued to oppose any measure embodying its principle. The following quotation from a speech made by him in New Orleans discloses his attitude on the subject at the time:

I say to you what I have ever said to my own constituents in Illinois, I will vote for no man who is in favor of the Wilmot Proviso. When I am required by my constituents to support that measure, as much as I value their confidence, as highly as I appreciate the distinctions they have conferred on me, I will not hesitate to resign my post and retire to private station.²⁸

It was with interest and with some difference of opinion that his state awaited the moment when their Senator would actually be called upon to "obey" or to "resign." Several candidates entered the field in anticipation of his resignation.²⁹ The Ottawa Free Trader of January 19, expressed the hope that he would not resign. "Judge Douglas," it wrote, "Will find no difficulty, in our opinion, in harmonizing his course with any pledges he has ever made, and yet be able to satisfy his constituents, so that his enemies may as well stop crowing for the present."³⁰

In spite of his attitude a southern Illinois paper declared, "But he won't resign, although his resignation would be perfectly satisfactory to his constituency."³¹

28. Chicago Daily Journal, Jan. 24, 1849.

29. Ibid.

30. Quotation from Ottawa Free Trader printed in Chicago Daily Journal, January 24, 1849.

31. Editorial in Illinois Republican, Belleville, June 12, 1849.

On October 22, 1849, he defended his stand on this measure. He declared that had the Wilmot Proviso been made a part of the treaty with Mexico a great injustice would have been perpetrated against the states which would be formed from the Mexican Cession. If any of these states insisted upon recognizing slavery within its bounds the treaty would be broken and as a result the other portions of that document might also be declared null and void.³² A few months later he argued that under this provision California and New Mexico could never have been obtained. The Senators from slave states could not vote for it and as a result the necessary two-thirds vote for the acceptance of the treaty could never have been obtained.³³

California sought admission to the Union in February 1850, and excitement and agitation over slavery increased that spring. Meetings favoring the Wilmot Proviso were held in Waukegan, Ottawa, and other places.³⁴ A non-partisan free soil meeting presided over by Mayor J.H. Woodworth was held in the city hall at Chicago to oppose slavery and to promote the Wilmot Proviso.³⁵ This assembly requested Senator Douglas to obey the resolutions of the Illinois Legislature in spirit and in reality or resign. The Senator had aided Henry Clay in preparing compromise measures, and had reported them from the Committee on Territories without the Proviso. Douglas did not want to resign, but he also believed in the right of instructions. Pressure from his state became strong enough that an amendment in keeping with its instructions was finally added. He claimed

32. Illinois State Register, Nov. 8, 1849.

33. Globe, 31 Congress, 1 session, Appendix XXII, 368.

34. Cole, 69.

35. Ibid., 69.

that he felt certain that the measure would not carry even with the Illinois vote. After a bitter attack upon it in the Senate he obeyed the instruction³⁶ and voted for it, but, as he expected, it failed.

Agitation and debate over the compromise measures continued throughout the summer of 1850. The delay in admitting California to the Union after she had made a constitution was bitterly denounced,³⁷ and the Whigs in northern Illinois continued to oppose the extension of slavery. Douglas favored the compromise measures which he and Clay had devised, and he nobly defended them in the city hall in Chicago on October 23, 1850. At that time he claimed that he himself had prepared the sections providing for the admission of California as a free state and for the creation of a territorial government in Utah and New Mexico which left the people therein to regulate their own domestic institutions.³⁸ Douglas insisted that the territories belonged to all the people of the United States and should be disposed of in a way that would benefit all. Southern rights could not be violated by prohibiting slavery nor northern rights by allowing the inhabitants to decide the question for themselves.³⁹ These compromise measures had passed one by one during September. Jefferson Davis declared that Senator Douglas⁴⁰ had every right to be proud of these measures.

Douglas himself was very satisfied with the results of his efforts.

He believed the measures removed all cause for sectional discontent,⁴¹ but

36. Davidson and Stuve, 636; Cole, 67

37. Editorial in Chicago Weekly Journal, June 10, 1850.

38. From a collection of the Speeches of Senator Douglas of Illinois, Washington, D.C., 1844-1855, 16.

39. Albert J. Beveridge, Abraham Lincoln 1809-1858, Houghton Mifflin Company, New York, 1928, II, 107.

40. Globe, 31 Congress, 1 session, XXII, 1830.

41. Ibid. m 1830.

such was not the case. One of these compromise provisions, the Fugitive Slave Law, required all citizens to assist in the capture of runaway slaves. For two years before its passage the proposal had aroused serious opposition, and after it became a law it reinforced sectional antagonism. Many mass meetings were called and numerous resolutions condemning the law were adopted. Intense feeling was especially prevalent in Chicago. On July 8, 1850 Alderman Dodge proposed a resolution in the Council that since the Supreme Court had decreed⁴³ that state officers were under no obligation to fulfill the duties imposed upon them as such officers by the Congress, they did not consider it their duty or the duty of their city officers to arrest fugitive slaves. It was unanimously carried.⁴⁴ Again on October 21, 1850, Alderman Throop offered a similar resolution. He branded the Senators and Representatives from free states who voted for this measure or failed to vote against it as betrayers "only to be ranked with the traitors Benedict Arnold and Judas Iscariot."⁴⁵ This accusation was aimed directly at Senator Douglas, who had been absent from the Senate when the Fugitive Slave Act was passed. More than once it was inferred that he had sneaked away in order to aid its passage.⁴⁶ This he publicly denied declaring that he most assuredly would have voted for that measure as he had done for all the other compromise measures had he not been unavoidably absent. Arrangements to pay a \$4000 note about to fall due in New York had not gone through. He was, therefore, forced to go to New York at once that he might prevent

42. Harris, 177.

43. Story vs. Prigg case, Beveridge, 126.

44. Fremont O. Bennett, Politics and Politicians of Chicago, Cook County and Illinois, The Blakely Printing Company, Chicago, 1886, 73-74.

45. Ibid., 74; Goodspeed, 14.

46. Bennett, 74; Johnson, Douglas, 188.

the note being protested. His fellow senators assured him that the bill would not be up for discussion for another week but while dining with some Illinois friends in New York he received word that the bill was ready for its third reading. He rushed back, but arrived too late for the final vote. Senator Shields, so Douglas claimed, had dissuaded him from explaining his absence immediately upon his return. Shields felt certain that everyone knew Douglas was for the bill. Public vindication was finally made upon the floor of the Senate, but not until after Douglas had been made the target of many insulting remarks.

Despite the vindication, Douglas continued to be severely criticized for his connection with the passage of the Fugitive Slave Law. On October 22, 1850, a mass meeting of citizens was held in the city hall at Chicago. Fiery speeches were delivered and numerous resolutions⁴⁸ were proposed. However, before the final adoption of any of these resolutions Stephen A. Douglas appeared at the gathering. He invited all those who were interested to return the next evening and listen to his explanation of the law that was being considered so obnoxious. There were some who favored the Fugitive Slave Law, and there were others who feared that this open opposition to the law might prompt Congress to retaliate by cutting off harbor appropriations and railroad grants. The enemies of the law were anxious to hear how it could possibly be justified. As a result of all these attitudes the hall was filled on October 23. Douglas spoke for three and one half hours. He listed the compromise measures and briefly discussed them, one by one.

48. Chicago Daily Democrat, October 23, 1850.

He began the discussion of the Fugitive Slave Law by reading the preamble and the resolutions which had been adopted by the City Council two nights before.⁴⁹ Their objections he reduced to two, namely, in violation of the Constitution the law suspended the writ of habeas corpus in time of peace; and it abolished the right of trial by jury.⁵⁰ He then set forth to explain that this new law was only amendatory to the old fugitive law of 1793. The old law had been wrecked when Judge Story decreed that any state might forbid its officials to enforce the national statute.⁵¹

In Douglas' own words,

The provisions of the old law have been submitted to the test of long experience - to the scrutiny of the bar and the judgment of the courts. The writ of habeas corpus had been adjudged to exist in all cases under it, and had always been resorted to when a proper case arose. In amending the law there was no necessity for any new provision upon this subject, because nobody desired to change it in this respect.⁵²

He also announced to his audience that in the opinion of Attorney General Crittenden this recent law was consistent with the Constitution and did not suspend the wit of habeas corpus. As for the objection concerning the trial by jury he pointed out that the new law left that question exactly where the old law had left it. In fact the old law was silent on this point, and the courts had always decided the procedure in accordance with the Constitution. "If the act of last session be repealed," he said, "that will neither benefit nor injure the fugitive, so far as the right of trial by jury is concerned."⁵³ The new law, it was true, made no provision

49. Speech by Douglas, 19.

50. Ibid., 21.

51. *Prigg vs. Pennsylvania*, 16 Peters, 539-614, January Term, 1842.

52. Sheahan, 175.

53. Speech by Douglas, 23. October 28, 1850.

for jury trial of a fugitive slave, but it was expected that such cases would be managed as they had been in the past. The chief difference between the law of 1793 and that of 1850 was that the latter provided that national rather than state officials should enforce it.⁵⁴ Anyone hindering the arrest or aiding in the escape of a fugitive was punishable by a heavy fine.

This speech of October 23, 1850 in Chicago has been considered a great personal victory for Douglas. Whether by the force of his personality or by the logic of his words, he did win over his listeners. After he had answered their questions he proposed that those present adopt a resolution pledging support to the Union, the Constitution, and the laws of Congress. A member of the audience suggested that they add a clause repudiating the resolutions adopted by the City Council two nights before. The original proposal together with the suggested addition was formally adopted with very little protest.⁵⁵ At a meeting of the Council the next evening Alderman Hamilton moved to "expunge" from the records the resolutions condemning those who aided in the passage of the Fugitive Slave Law. The motion was laid on the table,⁵⁶ but on November 29, 1850, it was agreed to allow the resolutions to remain.⁵⁷

During the session of 1851 the Legislature of Illinois took on an attitude of good will. It rescinded the Wilmot Proviso resolutions and all parties accepted the passage of the Compromise of 1850. Two years before every Whig in both Houses had voted to adopt those resolutions which they now voted to rescind.⁵⁸

54. Beveridge, II, 126.

55. Willia, 165.

56. Bennett, 74-75.

57. Goodspeed, 15.

58. Davidson and Stuve, 636-637.

But in spite of these signs of harmony the abolition movement continued to develop. In September 1851 Illinois sent delegates to the two national anti-slavery conventions at Buffalo and Cleveland. The resolutions and acts passed by these conventions did not satisfy the abolitionists of Illinois. They desired stronger opposition to slavery and consequently continued to agitate for a true National Liberty party.⁵⁹ During the winter of 1851-1852 definite efforts were taken to unite all those who opposed slavery.⁶⁰ Through the press and in conventions the Free Democratic party of Illinois took an active part in the campaign of 1852. A law passed by the Legislature on February 12, 1853 prompted them to increase their efforts in opposition to the pro-slavery group. The law prohibited the immigration of free negroes into Illinois. It made it a crime to bring colored persons into the state. Any negro who appeared in Illinois and remained there for ten days was liable to arrest and to a fine of fifty dollars. If he were unable to pay he could be sold to the person who would assume the costs of his trial.⁶¹ In reality the law was an act of hostility toward the abolitionists who were aiding fugitive slaves and a concession to the Southerners who could reclaim their slaves by the payment of court costs. Its supporters defended it on the economic grounds that it would prevent an over-supply of negro labor in Illinois, but definite and active opposition to it continued.⁶² Whig and Democratic papers joined the Free Democrats in condemning it. The Chicago Journal, Alton Courier, Alton Telegraph, Belleville Advocate and Galena Advertiser were among the list of opponents.⁶³

59. Harris, 181.

60. Ibid., 182.

61. Ibid., 188.

62. Ibid., 188.

63. Ibid., footnote, 188.

Senator Douglas' opposition to the Wilmot Proviso and his support of the Fugitive Slave Law put him noticeably out of tune with the anti-slavery sentiments which were spreading so rapidly among his constituents. He saw the danger of his party falling apart. He had worked for twenty years to become a party leader and he maintained that he would abide by the policy of his party. The desire to extend slavery into the territories came from the South which was largely Democratic in its party affiliations.⁶⁴ Herein lay the difficulty. Douglas never gave any absolute indication that he was pro-slavery in his sympathies. He once said in reference to the subject, "I think it is a curse beyond computation to both white and black."⁶⁵ On a par with his desire to remain a party leader, was his keen interest in the development of the West. The South hesitated to agree to the admission of states that would destroy the balance of power on slavery issues. At this point Stephen A. Douglas was in a very delicate position. He wished to remain the leader of the Democratic Party, and the strength of that party lay in the South. He was interested in the development of the West, but southern senators would not aid in the organization of territories or states where slavery was to be excluded. Among his constituents was the ever growing agitation to abolish slavery.

The year 1850 found Douglas, in the face of these conditions, adopting a policy to which he adhered to the end of his life. To him the great agitation over the extension of slavery was futile - futile because it was in direct opposition to the will of nature - futile also, because it could not successfully thrive nor be successfully abolished without local coopera-

64. Major George Murray McConnell, "Recollections of Stephen A. Douglas," Illinois State Historical Society, Transactions for 1900, vol.IV, 48-49.

65. Ibid., 48.

tion. Climate, soil, agricultural products, and local police protection were the factors that decided where slavery would or would not exist. He frequently expressed his conclusion in this regard. When Calhoun cited the Ordinance of 1787 as an instance of the South's exclusion from the public domain Douglas replied:

These facts furnish a practical illustration of that great truth which ought to be familiar to all statesmen and politicians that a law passed by the national legislature to operate locally upon a people not represented will always remain practically a dead letter upon the statute book, if it be in opposition to the wishes and supposed interests of those who are to be affected by it, and at the same time charged with its execution. The Ordinance of 1787 was practically a dead letter. It did not make the country to which it applied practically free from slavery. The states formed out of the territory northwest of the Ohio did not become free by virtue of the ordinance nor in consequence of it (but) by virtue of their own free will.⁶⁶

Out of this contention developed his doctrine of "squatter sovereignty" or "popular sovereignty" as it was sometimes known. This doctrine encompassed the principles: "That Congress shall neither legislate slavery into any territory or state, nor out of the same; but the people shall be left free to regulate their domestic concerns in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States."⁶⁷ The fundamental principle of local self-government based upon the love of the frontier for individualism, together with the fulfillment of the laws of nature, was the only logical basis upon which the question could be settled.⁶⁸ Predicting that

66. Globe, 31 Congress, 1 session, Appendix XXII, 369-370.

67. Douglas' Speech in the Senate on the Kansas-Nebraska Bill, Carr, 190.

68. Professor Frederick J. Turner, "The Middle West," in The International Monthly, vol.IV, pp.806-807, 1910.

out of the territory stretching from the Mississippi to the Pacific. Seventeen free states would be formed, Douglas ridiculed the idea that a balance of power could be maintained in the United States through legislation. He questioned where would be found sufficient slave territory to balance seventeen free states.⁶⁹ He insisted that in no way was he a traitor because in reality he was opening the South to freedom rather than the North to slavery.⁷⁰

Senator Douglas seemed sincere in his belief that slavery agitation in Congress would cease if the question of slavery in the new territories were left to the people who resided therein. The development of the West continued to be an important objective of Douglas' life. About the same time that the slavery issue commanded so great a part of his attention, he became the ardent champion of a Pacific Railway. As we have noted the success of this project depended to a large extent upon the organization of Nebraska.

Between Missouri's two Senators, Thomas H. Benton and David R. Atchison there existed a spirit of rivalry and antagonism. They both desired the organization of Nebraska and the construction of a Pacific Railway. However, Atchison publicly refused to support the above mentioned projects unless his constituents could enter the territory with their slaves. Thus he contended that the repeal of the Missouri Compromise was necessary. Benton assailed this plan, and the repeal of that document became an issue of Missouri politics.⁷¹

69. Johnson, Douglas, 180.

70. McConnell, 49.

71. Beveridge, 171-172.

Furthermore the Wyandot Indians from Ohio had been given land in the Nebraska country close to Missouri. Congress delayed so long in granting them territorial government that they set up a provincial government of their own in 1852.⁷² The settlers consisted of Indians, missionaries, and other white persons connected with the federal government's military station. They elected as a delegate to Congress a Reverend Thomas Johnson, a slavery advocate. This procedure interested Hadley D. Johnson of Iowa. He was a member of the Iowa Legislature and a railroad advocate, who was also interested in Nebraska. Through his influence a group of frontiersmen crossed the Missouri, and on October 11, 1853, they chose the Iowa Johnson as a delegate. There was nothing legal about these elections, but they indicated a rather widespread interest in the organization of Nebraska.⁷³ In order to prevent dispute Hadley Johnson suggested that the territory be divided so that both Johnsons might retain the office when the region would be organized.⁷⁴

On December 14, 1853 Senator Dodge of Iowa introduced a bill for the organization of the Territory of Nebraska.⁷⁵ It was exactly like one that Representative Hall of Missouri had presented at the last session, and that had been lost in the Senate.⁷⁶ Douglas, as Chairman of the Committee on Territories, was intrusted with the management of this bill. Senator Atchison and Senator Douglas were close friends. It is believed according to Atchison's own story that he appealed to Douglas to incorporate into Dodge's Nebraska bill a clause that would repeal the Missouri Compromise.⁷⁶

72. Ibid., 173.

73. Ibid., 174.

74. Ibid., 175.

75. Ibid., 175.

76. Ray, 201-202.

This appeal was consistent with the "popular sovereignty" theory of Douglas. Long before Congress had met, the press predicted a struggle over the repeal of the Missouri Compromise.⁷⁷

On January 4, 1850 Douglas reported the Nebraska bill of Senator Dodge back to the Senate with important amendments providing for the establishment of the principles of the compromise measures of 1850.⁷⁸

Discussion on the bill was postponed until January 23, but in the meantime the radical Whig, Senator Dixon of Kentucky gave notice that when the bill came up he would propose an amendment that would repeal the Missouri Compromise.⁷⁹ Whether or not this was a clever ruse to test Douglas has not been ascertained, but it forced him to openly proclaim his position on this issue.⁸⁰

He reported on January 23, a substitute known as the Kansas-Nebraska bill which unmistakably repealed the Compromise of 1820.⁸¹ Dixon announced that he would not consider his own amendment any longer. This pleased Douglas who had feared that Dixon would attempt to legislate slavery into the territories.⁸²

The following day brought forth the publication of Chase's bitter attack upon the bill.⁸³ It interpreted Douglas' share in this document as a move for Southern support in order to attain the Presidency. Douglas defended himself against this and other violent attacks. He insisted that

his motives were merely to open the Nebraska country in order to promote

77. Beveridge, 172.

78. Ray, 205-206.

79. Ibid., 207.

80. Ibid., 211.

81. Ibid., 211; Beveridge, 183.

82. Beveridge, 183.

83. Appeal to the People of the United States by the Independent Democrats in Congress.

the settlement of the West under the principles of local self government. It was practically impossible for him to make public the connection between the Pacific railroad and the organization of Nebraska. To advocate a northern route was to antagonize the South. To favor a Chicago terminal was to sacrifice the interests of his southern constituents. By promoting a St. Louis terminal he sacrificed his own interests as well as those of his northern constituents.⁸⁴

After lengthy and exhausting debates the bill passed the Senate shortly after five o'clock on the morning of March 4, 1854 by a majority of almost three to one. Frenzied opposition in the House threatened to defeat it, but the necessary leadership was provided by Douglas. Beveridge says, "Every moment of that desperate struggle found him in the House, counselling, inspiring, directing."⁸⁵ The passage of the bill by a majority of thirteen rewarded his efforts and President Pierce signed the document that was to bring so much condemnation upon the "Little Giant" of Illinois.

84. Beveridge, 171 - footnote

85. Ibid., 216-217.

CHAPTER V

DOUGLAS AND THE SLAVERY ISSUE IN ILLINOIS 1854-1861

The repeal of the Missouri Compromise on May 30, 1854 was a great shock to the people of Illinois. For weeks before the Kansas-Nebraska Act was passed expressions of indignation were registered through the press and at numerous mass meetings. Chicago was particularly active in this respect. Months before, a Chicago paper had discussed the proposed law as a bid of Senator Douglas for the Presidency.¹ The argument of the New York Evening Post was upheld in Chicago.² It had declared that the Compromise of 1850 should in no way be applied to Nebraska, because that measure had been formulated to settle a difficulty pertaining to the area which had been acquired from Mexico. Senator Dixon, who had proposed the amendment to allow the people in a territory to decide the slavery problem for themselves, received his share of criticism.³ Until August 1854 the entire Chicago press condemned Douglas and the Kansas-Nebraska Act. At that time, however, a Washington journalist, James W. Sheahan, established the Chicago Times, which became so friendly to Douglas that he was said to be its owner.⁴

Resolutions adopted during the months immediately preceding the signing of the obnoxious law were no less indicative of bitter opposition toward it. At a meeting held in Chicago in February 8, 1854 there were passed resolutions

condemning the proposed measure. The objections of those present are

1. Editorial in Chicago Daily Journal, January 16, 1854.

2. Ibid., January 17, 1854.

3. Ibid., January 20, 1854.

4. Beveridge, II, 230.

tersely stated in the following brief passage:

That the passage of the (Nebraska) bill for the repeal or molestation of the Missouri Compromise, will destroy the harmony which now exists between the north and the south, create sectional disturbances and perpetual agitation of questions which have heretofore been regarded as settled by the unanimous consent of the nation.⁵

Their hostility prompted them to virtually demand the Legislature to instruct the Illinois delegation in Congress to oppose the bill.⁶

This hostile spirit of indignation existed not only in Chicago, for anti-Nebraska meetings were called throughout the state during March and April of that year.⁷ One in Freeport pledged the organization of a new party to oppose the extension of slavery through the abrogation of the Missouri Compromise or the annexation of more slave territory.⁸ Later on in the summer after the passage of the law an assembly in Kane County resolved:

We, the people of Kane county in mass convention assembled irrespective of party, in view of the long continued encroachments of the slave power, culminating at last in the repeal of the law of freedom in all the hitherto unorganized territories of the Union, will cooperate with the friends of freedom throughout the State in an effort to bring the government back to just principles; to restore Kansas and Nebraska to the position of free territories; to repeal the fugitive slave law; to restrict slavery to the States in which it exists; to prohibit the admission of any more slave States in the Union; to exclude slavery from all the territories over which the general government has exclusive jurisdiction; resist the acquirements of any new slave territory, and the repeal of the inhuman and barbarous black laws of this State.⁹

About the same time a Dupage County Free Democratic convention at

5. Davidson and Stuve, 639.

6. Harris, 189; Davidson and Stuve, 639.

7. Davidson and Stuve, 641.

8. Ibid., 641.

9. Ibid., 641.

Wheaton declared that a new party was necessary in order to recapture liberty as the basis for government.¹⁰

To face the criticism and the wrath of his constituents Senator Stephen A. Douglas returned to his home in Chicago during August. He was not there long when he announced that he would address his fellow citizens at the North Market Hall on the evening of September 1. Rhodes expressed Douglas' position rather mildly when he said, "Rarely has it been the lot of a senator to speak to a more discontented crowd than he confronted that night."¹¹ The press had been busily engaged in promoting agitation and resentment. Especially caustic in its attack was the Tribune, but another paper as well declared that Mr. Douglas had organized a bodyguard of five hundred armed Irishmen who were to prevent Americans from participating in the meeting and to maintain silence while he spoke.¹² It was also told that every revolver and pistol in the city was sold with large orders remaining unfilled. Throughout Chicago and northern Illinois public opinion was molded to expect violence and armed force on the evening of Douglas' address. Then, too, Douglas, from time to time during the preceding months had aroused the hostility of various groups in his state.

On March 14, 1854 a memorial signed by 3050 clergymen of New England had been presented in the Senate in protest of the Kansas-Nebraska Bill. It was based upon the Appeal of Chase and Sumner and drew bitter denunciation from Douglas.¹³ Copies of this memorial were sent to the ministers in the North. When Chicago newspapers began to publish the debate over the New England clerical protest, twenty-five ministers of that city signed a

10. Harris, 190.

11. James Ford Rhodes, History of the United States from the Compromise of 1850, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1893, p.61.

similar document. Douglas again attacked clerical interference in politics and government, but the attack served only to strengthen their determination to oppose him and his policy. Voices from many pulpits became a great force in the establishment of a new party, and throughout Illinois the majority of clergymen supported the side of which Lincoln was soon to become the leader.¹⁴

On July 4, Douglas had delivered a speech in Philadelphia in which he denounced the Know Nothings, a sort of secret organization formed as a result of the increased immigration from Europe. It sponsored a movement against Roman Catholics, foreigners, and finally slavery, and was most active in large cities. Hence his Philadelphia denunciation served to disgruntle the members of the organization not only in Chicago but throughout Illinois.¹⁵ The anti-slavery people were aroused over the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and the commercial interests, captains, engineers, deckhands, and longshoremen resented his having voted against the River and Harbor bill of 1854.¹⁶

The Germans in Illinois were among the first to positively oppose the Kansas-Nebraska Act.¹⁷ On March 16, 1854, they held a mass meeting in

South Market Hall in Chicago where vigorous sentiments against the repeal

12. (continued from p.85) Davidson and Stuve, 640-641; Beveridge, 231.

13. (" " " Beveridge, II, 221.

14. Ibid., 222.

15. Ibid., 226-227.

16. Ibid., 230; Davidson and Stuve, 640-641.

17. F.I. Herriott, The Germans of Chicago and Stephen A. Douglas, a pamphlet reprinted from Deutsch-Amerikanische Geschichtsblätter Jahrbuch der Deutsch-Amerikanischen Historischen Gesellschaft von Illinois-Jakrgong, 1912(XII) 1-7.

of the Missouri Compromise were manifested.¹⁸ Their objections were based directly upon their interest in the welfare of the Germans. The Union was the hope of European refugees, and they opposed the repeal of the Missouri Compromise because it meant the renewal of the discussion of slavery which would threaten its stability. The extension of slavery into the West was distasteful to them because they foresaw the degradation of the German character as its ultimate result. The existence of slave labor in the West would make ordinary manual labor impossible for the self-respecting German. Furthermore, there was a Homestead Bill pending in Congress. The Germans were sensitive to the prejudices exhibited against the foreign born in general and the Germans in particular by southern senators and representatives who were opposing the homestead bills.¹⁹

On March 2, 1854 Senator Clayton of Delaward had offered an amendment to the Kansas-Nebraska bill which confined the rights of voting and office holding in the territories to United States citizens. Senators Douglas and Shields did not speak against the amendment, but they did vote against it. Nevertheless it passed by a vote of 23-21, and thus amended, the bill was carried through the Senate. Both Douglas and Shields voted for the bill itself and it appeared that the right of way for slaveholders in the Far West was a real danger to the Germans and other foreign born.²⁰ Knowing these sentiments enables one to better understand the proceedings of the Germans' meeting in South Market Hall in Chicago on March 16. Here they

18. Ibid., p.7.

19. Ibid., p.8.

20. Ibid., p.11.

adopted resolutions condemning the proposed bill and also the leaders of the Democratic party. One resolution was devoted to Douglas. It read as follows:

Resolved, That we especially consider Stephen A. Douglas as an ambitious and a dangerous demagogue, that we consider him a blemish upon the honor of the State of Illinois, and deem it our duty to (do) our best to rid ourselves of him as quick as possible.²¹

Another condemned the Legislature for "the servile manner" in which it "hurried itself into an endorsement of the Nebraska bill."²²

As if it were impossible to overemphasize the resentment of the German people toward Douglas a supplementary resolution was introduced after the resolutions of the committee were adopted. It left no doubt concerning the attitude that prevailed among those present. It declared:

Resolved, That we consider the political career of Senator Douglas is terminated, and that he is deprived of public confidence and subject to general indignation, that we do not deem him worthy any longer to represent the state of Illinois in Congress and we therefore expect him to resign his seat in the Senate immediately.²³

After the meeting a likeness of Douglas, bearing a sign "The Benedict Arnold of 1854" was carried into the street. The procession following it journeyed by way of Clark and Randolph streets to the Court House Square where the effigy was burned. The Tribune reported the affair as one of the strongest manifestations against any public man in the city's history.²⁴

Although Senator Douglas was fearless in answering the clergy of his own city and of New England, and in denouncing the policies of the Know

21. Ibid., 16-17.

22. Ibid., 17.

23. Ibid., 17.

24. Ibid., 19.

However, there were reasons to believe that the influential Germans dis-
approved of the effigy burning.²⁵

Although Senator Douglas was fearless in answering the clergy of his own city and of New England, and in denouncing the policies of the Know Nothings, he maintained silence as far as the activities of his German constituents were concerned. It is believed that Douglas' apprehension of German opposition prompted him to advise Colonel Richardson to maneuver the Kansas-Nebraska bill through the House without Clayton's Senate amendment.²⁶

It was against the judgment and counsel of his closest friends that Senator Douglas returned to Illinois to face these hostile groups and to address them in his home city in defense of the recent law. Early in the afternoon of September 1, the flags on the boats at the docks were put at half mast. Toward evening bells throughout the city began to toll continuing to fill the air with their mournful sound until Douglas appeared in the square near the Hall.²⁷ On account of the intense heat the meeting was held outside, and a huge crowd gathered. In the crowd were very few friends of the Senator. His approach was greeted with silence but soon the heckling and hissing began. He made a futile attempt to explain how misunderstood was the Kansas-Nebraska Act. His denunciations of the Tribune and of the Know Nothings were drowned in groans, yells, and mocking songs. After a few hours²⁸ ceaseless interruption, the Senator left with his few friends, and made his way to the Tremont House amidst confusion and insult.

The Democratic press of Illinois condemned the Chicago outrage, but it

25. Ibid., 20.

26. Ibid., 24.

27. Davidson and Stuve, 641; Beveridge, II, 232; Rhodes, 61.

continued to disapprove the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. A paragraph from a letter to the Daily Democratic Press very well expressed the consensus of opinion in that respect.

That Judge Douglas has been a most able and distinguished champion in fighting the battles of democracy - that he has done more to develop the resources and advance the interests of Illinois than any other man in the State, I most cordially admit, and feel grateful to him for it. But that he and the administration have committed two great errors in policy - in their appointments and the repeal of the Missouri Compromise line - his most devoted friend cannot with any sincerity deny.²⁹

A convention of anti-Nebraska Democrats of the First Congressional District gathered at Rockford on September 13, and resolved that the regulation of the territories was clearly within the realm of Congress. Since the territories belonged to all the people, to deny Congress that right, the delegates said, was to deny "popular sovereignty" in its strictest sense.³⁰

The press continued to condemn and ridicule Douglas for inconsistency. It was pointed out that in his first Nebraska bill he considered the repeal of the Missouri Compromise a departure from the Compromise of 1850, yet his second bill provided for that repeal.³¹ Because a Richmond paper exalted Douglas after having attacked General Cass for displaying the same attitude toward slavery, the Press concluded the deed had been accomplished to court Southern favor.³²

Neither the Chicago demonstration, the press, nor convention resolutions discouraged Senator Douglas. He started on a tour throughout the state to

28. (continued from p.89) Rhodes states it as one hour; Beveridge as two; and Davidson and Stuge as four.

29. Daily Democratic Press, September 16, 1854.

30. Ibid., September 19, 1854.

31. Ibid., September 20, 1854.

defend the law that had caused so much dissension within Illinois.³² He found the northern and central counties especially anti-Nebraska. Everywhere he went he was being burned in effigy, and his reception in these areas was very cool.³³ His speech was practically the same in every city. He stressed local self-government as an American principle and enumerated the benefits that would come to all through the development of the West. When it came to the slavery issue he pointed out the sectional nature of the Missouri Compromise. Since 1850 he had maintained that while slavery was excluded from the land north of 36°30' the states to be formed south of that line were to be "admitted into the Union with or without slavery as the people of each state asking admission may desire."³⁴ Furthermore he tried to emphasize the same idea he had expressed four years before, namely, that the "laws of nature, of climate, and of production" would effectually exclude slavery from the greater part of the West.³⁵ He recalled the refusal of even the anti-slavery groups to observe that line as well as his own futile attempts to stop slavery agitation by extending it to the Pacific. He upheld the Compromise of 1850 as the embodiment of a national rather than a sectional principle and the Kansas-Nebraska Act because it was the "logical, natural, and necessary application of that principle."³⁶ A summary of an article from the Galena Jeffersonian³⁷ reported that the Senator spoke to four or five hundred in that city, giving the same old speech which it described as a cold, spiritless affair.

32 (continued from p.90) Ibid., September 28, 1854.

33. Harris, 193.

34. Globe, 31 Congress, 1 session, XXII, p.365.

35. Ibid., 370.

36. Beveridge, 235.

37. Daily Democratic Press, November 1, 1854.

In Springfield Douglas received a little better treatment. The State Fair was in progress when he arrived and he was met by personal friends and old time delegates.³⁸ However, it was interpreted that disapproval existed there too, by the small crowd that gathered to hear him speak.³⁹

Douglas never failed to attack the Know Nothings who were circulating the rumors that he advocated Roman Catholicism⁴⁰ and favored foreigners.⁴¹ He always insisted that the disorderly meeting of September 1, in Chicago was the work of that organization. He also attacked the newly formed Republican party. In November 1854 this party had elected twenty eight representatives making an anti-Nebraska majority of eighteen in the Senate and fifteen in the House and giving them courage and hope for the 1856 election.

The press of Chicago continued to uphold the anti-Nebraska forces and it recognized Judge Trumbull's election to the United States Senate as a good sign.⁴² An anti-Democratic paper of Springfield rebuked Douglas for calling all who did not approve of "squatter sovereignty" abolitionists and for avoiding all mention of the existing conditions in Kansas.⁴³

Again in September 1855 Douglas toured the central and southern sections of Illinois in an attempt to explain his position in regard to slavery.⁴⁴

The paper which later became the chief organ of Lincoln and his followers gleefully published disparaging accounts of his speeches. In describing his address in St. Louis it announced that even the Missouri Democrat pro-

38. Harris, 193.

39. Daily Democratic Press, October 6, 1854

40. The second Mrs. Douglas was a Catholic. They were married by the Rev. J.B. Byrne.

41. Beveridge, 235.

42. Judge Trumbull had spoken against the bill.

43. Editorial in Daily Illinois State Journal, September 19, 1855.

44. Harris, 196.

nounced it a disappointment and a failure.⁴⁵ The Southern Illinoisan, an old Democratic paper published at Shawneetown, claimed that Douglas' tour in the southern part of the state widened the breach between himself and the people, turning many friends into enemies. "The people," it declared, "are satisfied with Douglas' trickery who secures the appointment of abolitionists to office, associates with them, and then goes about the country crying from the stump that the Union is in danger of being disrupted by the very party whose members it has helped into power."⁴⁶

Opposition in Illinois to the extension of slavery in the territories continued on into 1856. On February 22, of that year the Anti-Nebraska Editorial Convention met at Decatur to promote the cooperation and to provide for the organization of the various elements within the state which were opposed to slavery extension.⁴⁷ It recommended that a delegate convention be held in Bloomington on May 29, 1856.⁴⁸ Such a convention did gather there in Major's Hall, but nearly one third of the counties of the state were unrepresented.⁴⁹ It was a mixed gathering, comprised of groups suspicious of one another, and in some cases openly antagonistic on all points except opposition toward the extension of slavery, the national administration, and Douglas.⁵⁰ However, the proceedings were reported as

harmonious and out of the convention was launched the Republican party in Illinois.⁵¹ The Whig and Know Nothing groups were not wholly absorbed by the Republicans especially in the northern part of the state and while in

the central and southern areas many Democrats joined the new party, the

45. Ibid., October 23, 1855.

46. Daily Illinois State Journals, September 25, 1855.

47. John Howard Todd, Illinois Thy Wondrous Story, Chicago Herald Company, Chicago, 1914, p.53; Davidson and Stuve, 651.

48. Todd, p.53.

Democratic ranks were swelled by the addition of many Whigs. The Germans of Madison and St. Clair counties left the Democratic party for the Republican, but the Whigs of Sangamon, Tazewell, Morgan, and Adams counties joined the Democrats.⁵² This realignment of groups was a sort of culmination of events in Illinois during the previous decade.

About this same time, the Kansas problem became prominent in Congress. Intense rivalry between slavery and anti-slavery men who were attempting to apply "popular sovereignty" in Kansas resulted in the establishment of two separate settlements and territorial governments. Several bills dealing with the difficult problem were presented to Congress.⁵³ As the House and Senate debated the proposed measures James H. Lane, a cunning and resourceful emigrant from Indiana to Kansas,⁵⁴ brought to Washington what he claimed to be the Free State constitution which had been adopted by the Free State Party at Topeka on October 23, 1857. Sentences had been scratched out, interlined, and deleted. Douglas to whose committee it was referred pointed out this mutilated condition and branded the document a forgery. The Republicans did little to defend it, so the Senate ignored it.⁵⁵ Tidings of all sorts of outrages soon emanated from the Kansas Territory and "Bleeding Kansas" became a topic of extensive discussion and a source of considerable political agitation in the free states. The opposition press in Illinois indicated that there existed the feeling that President Pierce and Senator Douglas were largely responsible for conditions in Kansas. Both men were classified as "short sighted political gamblers,"⁵⁶ and the move-

49. (continued from p.93) Davidson and Stuve, 651;

50. (" " " Beveridge, 365.

51. (" " " Todd, 53; Davidson and Stuve, 652-653.

52. Davidson and Stuve, 654.

53. Beveridge, 336-337.

54. Ibid., 323-324.

55. Ibid., 338.

ment behind the Kansas-Nebraska Act was said to be nothing more than a plan of Douglas to make Kansas a slave state.⁵⁷ The dreadful conditions in that state were explained as a portion of the plan to drive out free citizens.⁵⁸

The Kansas problem grew into a party battle for political and economic advantages, and became an important factor in the ultimate split in the Democratic Party. Because the admission of Kansas as a state was sought a convention was held at Lecompton, Kansas, in the fall of 1857. The result was the famous Lecompton Constitution which was endorsed by President

Buchanan and his cabinet. It was submitted to Congress February 2, 1858, by the President with the recommendation that the territory of Kansas be admitted as a state under its provisions.⁵⁹ Senator Douglas immediately

denounced the document⁶⁰ as unfair, illegal, and in direct opposition to his "popular sovereignty" doctrine.⁶¹ One cannot but admire him for his stand. It was a proslavery constitution and its creators knew that it would meet with general disapproval if submitted to the voters. For that reason they had resorted to fraud. The people were allowed to vote upon whether the Lecompton Constitution should be adopted with or without slavery. The former meant that there would be no limit to the number of slaves brought into Kansas; the latter, that no more slaves could be brought in, but that those there would remain. Outraged by such a proposition Free-

Soilers refused to go to the polls and the Constitution was adopted although
56. (continued from p.94) Editorial in Daily Illinois State Journal, July 7, 1856.

57. Ibid., July 8, 1856.

58. Ibid., July 11, 1856.

59. Moses, 609.

60. Ibid., 609; Milton, 272

61. Moses, 609.

less than 7000 votes were cast.⁶² The fall election of 1857 gave the Free Soil Party a majority in both houses of the territorial legislature, and they again offered the document to the voters for acceptance or rejection. This time the proslavery men, declaring the second vote was illegal, remained away from the polls, and the Constitution was defeated by over 10,000 votes.

Senator Douglas went to Washington in November 1857. He called on Buchanan and advised him not to submit this Constitution to Congress. Buchanan asked Douglas to say nothing about it until after the arrival of the news of the Kansas election. Douglas, in turn, asked him to withhold his recommendation also until after returns on the vote were published. The President insisted that he must recommend it in his message, to which Mr. Douglas replied that he would denounce it as soon as it was read. Buchanan, angered by Douglas' defiant manner, reminded him of the two Democratic senators who had dared to differ with Andrew Jackson. "He said 'Mr. Douglas, I desire you to remember that no Democrat ever yet differed from an Administration of his own choice without being crushed.' Douglas answered, 'Mr. President, I wish you to remember that General Jackson is dead.'"⁶³

The Northerners were delighted at Douglas' stand,⁶⁴ and the party heralded him as a champion of fair play.⁶⁵ The Germans of Chicago held mass meetings to express their pride in him⁶⁶ and a gathering at Springfield

on January 13, 1858 endorsed Douglas' position in the Senate. Similar meet-
 62. Arthur Meier Schlesinger, Political and Social History of the United States, 1829-1925. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1928, p.154.

63. Milton, p.273.

64. Ibid., p.279.

65. Cole, p.157.

66. Milton, p.279.

ings as well as formal conventions were held in nearly every county in Illinois. Again and again resolutions disapproving the admission of Kansas under the Lecompton Constitution were adopted.⁶⁷ The northern counties were decidedly on the side of Douglas, but there was a wavering among his southern constituents. However, meeting held at the county seat of Effingham County on January 8, 1858, adopted the following:

Resolved, That in our able and distinguished Senator, Stephen A. Douglas, we recognize the champion of equal rights and popular sovereignty, who by his recent position in regard to the Kansas Constitution has signified in an unmistakable manner his honest devotion to the true principles of the Democratic doctrine of self-government, and that we are proud to tender him an expression of our approval of his present course, and of our determination to give him our hearty support.⁶⁸

From the north end of the state came a similar expression when the Kane County Democrats met at the Geneva Court House on January 20, 1858. One section of the resolutions adopted by them read:

Resolved, That the position of the Honorable Stephen A. Douglas in opposing the admission of Kansas under the Lecompton Constitution, as it is about to be presented to Congress is that of the consistent friend of "popular sovereignty;" that his course meets with a hearty response from the Democracy of Old Kane; and we hereby pledge ourselves to stand by him against all assaults from whatever source they may come.⁶⁹

These and similar testimonies of sentiment indicated that Senator Douglas was once more heartily approved by large numbers in his State. The Democratic press was also again on his side.⁷⁰ By his defiant opposition to the Lecompton Constitution Stephen A. Douglas proved rather conclusively,

67. Mole, p.159.

68. Daily Chicago Times, January 20, 1858

69. Ibid., January 23, 1858.

70. Cole, p.157.

it would seem, that his "popular sovereignty" theory was based upon fundamental principle and sincerity. Had he really desired to court the favor of the South by encouraging the extension of slavery in the territories there was his opportunity. But instead, he dared to break with the Administration in an effort to prevent the perpetration of a fraud upon the rights of the people. This defiance had caused rejoicing among the Republicans. Those in the East thought they saw a chance of winning him over to their party, but the leading Illinois Republicans made no advance in this direction. They foresaw a split in the Democratic Party and laid plans to benefit thereby.⁷¹ The Republican press of Illinois and elsewhere

vied with the Democratic press in issuing statements of ridicule, scorn and abuse, and the campaign of 1858 became one of the greatest political

⁷²

battles ever waged in Illinois. Douglas was the only choice of his party in 1858 when he became a candidate for reelection.⁷³ This campaign brought

forth the famous Lincoln-Douglas debates so familiar to all. Lincoln sought to embarrass Douglas over his endorsement of the Dred Scott decision. The Illinois Senator had criticised the council of Chicago for denouncing the Dredd Scott decision.⁷⁴ Mr. Lincoln pointed out that by this decision

slavery was made lawful in the territories and could easily be made lawful in all the states. In answer to this Douglas repeated the argument he had frequently made during the previous ten years. A slaveholder's right was worthless without friendly local legislation and adequate local police protection. He maintained that if the people of a Territory wanted slavery,

they would soon pass the necessary laws for its regulation, but if they did

71. Chicago Daily Times, February 3, 1858; Milton, p.280.

72. Harris, 219; Beveridge, 507-509.

73. Ibid., p.207-213.

74. Carr, p.44.

not want it they could withhold legislation and make it "as dead as if prohibited by a constitutional prohibition."⁷⁵

Stephen A. Douglas was reelected United States Senator by a vote of 54 to 46. Although the Republicans won the State ticket the Democrats controlled the Legislature, and the Douglas Democrats greatly outnumbered the Buchanan Democrats. Gerrymandering and careful party organization were said to be responsible for this.⁷⁶ However, Douglas' personal popularity remained strong in his state. Many who opposed slavery remembered his condemnation of the Lecompton Constitution and supported him.⁷⁷ The fight in Illinois between Douglas and the Administration continued. Each group chose a full delegation to represent the state at the National Convention at Charleston.⁷⁷ The South was determined to end the party leadership of Douglas. Forty-five of the extreme Southern delegates withdrew and after ten stormy days the convention adjourned on May 3 to meet at Baltimore on June 7. At Baltimore the opposition was as violent as it had been at Charleston. More Southern delegates withdrew. This left matters in the hands of his supporters, and Douglas was declared nominated. The opposition forces, however, soon held a rival convention and nominated John C. Breckinridge of Kentucky for President.⁷⁸

The "Little Giant" paid dearly for his independent attitude toward the Administration and his defiance of party discipline, for the split in the Democratic ranks cost him the Presidency. Disappointing as this must have been to one so politically ambitious, defeat did not embitter him. Defeated,

75. Ibid., 81-82.

76. Harris, p.220.

77. Beveridge, p.704.

78. Carr, p.96-97.

he was ready to support and defend the Union and the Constitution as ardently as he had done as a victor. Abraham Lincoln arrived at Washington a few days before his inauguration. Douglas called upon him at Willard's Hotel, and the two prominent figures from Illinois spent a half hour together. Upon leaving, Douglas took Lincoln's hand and said, "You and I have been for many years politically opposed to each other, but in our devotion and attachment to the Constitution and Union we have never differed - in this we are one - this must and shall not be destroyed."⁷⁹

Douglas went forth to continue his efforts to end the national crisis by compromise. He had made his last speech in Congress on January 3, 1861. In it he summarized the origin and progress of the slavery agitation in the United States from 1789 to 1861, and then made a final plea to preserve the Union. "In my opinion," he said, "we have reached a point where disunion is inevitable, unless some compromise founded on mutual concession, can be made. I prefer compromise to war. I prefer concession to a dissolution of the Union. When I avow myself in favor of compromise, I do not mean that one side should give up all that it has claimed, nor that the other side should give up everything for which it has contended. Nor do I ask any man to come to my standard; but I simply say that I will meet any one half way who is willing to preserve the peace of the country, and save the Union from disruption upon principles of compromise and concession."⁸⁰

He begged for a compromise that would reach beyond party politics. To the Republicans he said:

⁷⁹. Milton, p.545.

⁸⁰. Douglas' last speech in Congress in Carr, p.252.

Why cannot you Republicans accede to the reestablishment and extension of the Missouri Compromise line? You have sung paeans enough in its praise, and uttered imprecations and curses enough upon my head for its repeal, one would think, to justify you now in claiming a triumph by its reestablishment. If you are willing to give up your party feelings - to sink the partisan in the patriot - and help me to reestablish and extend that line, as a perpetual bond of peace between the North and the South, I will promise you never to remind you in future of your denunciations of the Missouri Compromise, so long as I was supporting it, and of your praises of the same measure when we removed it from the statute book, after you had caused it to be abandoned, by rendering it impossible for us to carry it out. I seek no partisan advantage; I desire no personal triumph. I am willing to let by-gones be by-gones with every man who in this exigency will show by his vote that he loves his country more than his party.⁸¹

The spirit pervading this final plea guided the activities of Douglas throughout the spring of 1861. He supported the Crittenden Compromise and also submitted a plan of his own based on the doctrine of non-intervention and "popular sovereignty."⁸²

Early in February 1861 many signs pointed to danger in Illinois. Secret meetings were being held, and the Governor was informed of a growing sentiment toward disunion. A mass meeting in Pope County declared itself for the right of secession, and a gathering at Marion in Williamson County on April 15 pledged that it would aid in bringing about a division in the state which would join southern Illinois with the southern confederacy.⁸³ It was also said that several leading Democrats were advocating secession for that same section of the state if the issue came to war.⁸⁴

Reports of these ominous conditions in his state reached Stephen A. Douglas, and he decided that he would be more useful to the cause at home

81. *Ibid.*, 270.

83. *Ibid.*, 260.

82. Cole, 257.

84. *Ibid.*, 260.

than he was in Washington. Governor Yates had called a special session of the Illinois Legislature. Lanphier and other Douglas Democrats telegraphed the Senator that for grave reasons he ought to be in Springfield when

the Legislature convened.⁸⁵ He arrived in that city on April 25 and that evening his earnest and passionate plea for unity within his state aroused wild enthusiasm in the crowded Hall of Representatives. His speech was applauded by men of all parties. He was again the leader in his own state, pleading the cause of liberty and justice in a way that prompted John Wentworth to compare him to Patrick Henry.⁸⁶ He appealed to his consti-

tutents' loyalty, pointing out to them that there was no middle ground. One must be either a patriot or a traitor.⁸⁷ It is said that the personal force of the "Little Giant", together with his firm stand toward the necessity of saving the Union, prevented civil war in Illinois, and put 50,000 men in the Union Army from his state alone.⁸⁸ According to the Douglas family records it was the influence of the Illinois Senator which dissuaded Ulysses S. Grant from accepting a Confederate commission.⁸⁹

From Springfield Douglas traveled on to his home in Chicago. There, at National Hall on May 1, 1861, he delivered the last speech of his life. He censured disunionists for breaking up "the best Government on which the sun of heaven ever shed its rays" because of dissatisfaction regarding a Presidential election. There had never been a time, he exclaimed, "from the day that Washington was inaugurated first President of these United States, when the rights of the Southern States stood firmer under the laws of the land, than they do now; there never was a time when they had not as

85. Milton, 564.

86. Ibid., 565-566.

87. Moses, 643.

88. Milton, 566.

89. Douglas' last speech from a collection of war speeches available at

good cause for disunion as they have today."⁸⁹ To his listeners in Chicago he repeated what he had maintained in Springfield - there was no middle ground. He thanked God that Illinois was not divided, and thereby carried with him those constituents who had wavered. He warned them that only by laying aside party dissension and by "closing up the ranks" would Illinois prevent war upon its own soil. "While there was a hope of peace," he said, "I was ready for a reasonable sacrifice or compromise to maintain it. But when the question comes of war in the cotton fields of the South or the corn fields of Illinois, I say the farther off the better."⁹⁰

These last addresses contain no suggestion of bitterness nor desire for revenge. The crowds, generous with applause and praise, laid aside personal prejudices and centered their efforts upon the preservation of the Union. The Democratic party in the North was fired with the enthusiasm of its great leader so that it ceased to express any regards for the rights of the Southerners, nor any sympathy with their movement toward secession.⁹¹

The severe mental and physical strain of the last few years had so worn down the resistance of Senator Douglas that he was unable to withstand the fever that attacked him a few days after his memorable appearance before his fellow-citizens in Chicago. On June 3, 1861, he passed away at the old Tremont House where he had made his home.⁹²

The name of Douglas had become a powerful force throughout the United States. There were many who thought that he belonged to the nation and should, therefore, be buried in the nation's capital, but Illinois leaders would consent to no such arrangement.⁸⁹ (continued from p. 102) the Chicago Historical Society Library, 1.

89.

90. Ibid., 1-2.

91. Carr, 140.

92. Leonard W. Volk, History of the Douglas Monument at Chicago, Chicago Legal

ment.⁹³ He belonged to Illinois, the state he had chosen for his home; the state he had so well represented in the Congress of the United States. He had been ever mindful of the interests and welfare of his constituency, and only once did his policies and efforts run counter to those of the great majority of Illinois citizens. But nothing in his political career, before or after the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act, points to insincerity in his promotion of local self-government. He had repeatedly maintained that the Missouri Compromise "neither curtailed nor extended slavery one inch."⁹⁴ His desire to make Chicago a great railroad center through the opening up of the western territories was in keeping with all his efforts as a loyal citizen of that city.

For this one offense, however, his people had forgiven him, and at the time of his death they were ready to confer upon him every honor and token of respect. His remains lay in state in Bryant Hall from Tuesday until Thursday during which time 70,000 persons passed his bier in respectful silence. On Friday, the day of his burial, all business in Chicago was suspended for the day. The entire city was in mourning. Bells throughout the city tolled and the shots of guns resounded intermittently as a procession of about 10,000 marched the four miles to his grave.⁹⁵ He was buried at Oakenwald, his estate, where he had hoped to build a home for his

declining years.⁹⁶ A plot sixteen feet square was marked off and inclosed
 92 (continued from p.103) News Company, Chicago, 1880, p.8.

93. Milton, 569.

94. Globe, 31 Congress, 1 session, Appendix, XXII, 370.

95. Milton, 569.

96. Volk, k; Milton, 569.

by a rough board fence. During the session of 1864-1865 the Legislature of Illinois started proceedings to purchase the site of his grave. On March 1, 1865, it received from his widow a deed for this site for which it paid \$25,000.⁹⁷

On June 3, 1868 his remains were taken from the ground and placed in a sarcophagus, the marble in which had been brought from Rutland County, Vermont, his native state.⁹⁸ This monument is located on the north side of Thirty-fifth Street just west of the Illinois Central Railroad.⁹⁹ Standing aloft on the monument is a bronze figure of the "Little Giant" of Illinois overlooking the railroad he had helped to secure and the vast city which had ever been the object of his devotion.

97. Volk, p.27.

98. Ibid., p.86.

99. Ibid., p.123.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ESSAY

Source Material

The Congressional Globe printed in Washington, D.C. from 1834 to 1873 presents the debates and proceedings of Congress between those years and is therefore excellent source material through which to discover the policies of Senator Douglas and his actual course of conduct in the Senate. It does not reveal, however, the efforts of the Senator outside of the Halls of Congress. The Executive Documents of the Senate of the United States contain speeches and legislative proceedings that are helpful in the way just mentioned.

J.F. Rhodes, History of the United States from the Compromise of 1850, 3 volumes, Harper Brothers, New York, 1893, skillfully treats the policies and personalities of the decade 1850-1860. A rather critical appraisal of Douglas seems to be the result of the author's close personal relationship with the Senator and his family. A personal expression of conditions in Illinois before 1847 is given in Gov. Thomas Ford, A History of Illinois from its Commencement as a State in 1818 to 1847. S.C. Griggs and Company, Chicago, 1854. Fred Gerhard, Illinois As It Is, Keen and Lee, Chicago, 1857, contains history of early Illinois and includes copies of the early state constitutions.

James Madison Cutts, Constitutional and Party Questions, D.Appleton and Company, New York, 1866, is based on conversations between Douglas and his brother-in-law, Cutts, who claimed that Douglas paused long enough for him to take down his words. Its tone is boastful and several writers consider it to be unreliable. The Douglas-Breese correspondence contained in W.K. Ackerman, Early Illinois Railroads, Fergus Printing Company, Chicago, 1882, is reliable source material on the antagonism between the Illinois Senators over the Illinois Central Railroad bill. Interesting material based upon authentic court records is provided on the real estate holdings of Douglas in N.P. Iglehart and Co., History of the Douglas Estate in Chicago, H.A. Newcombe and Co., Chicago, 1869. Another personal reaction toward the "Little Giant" is given by Major George Murray McConnell, Recollections of Stephen A. Douglas, Illinois State Historical Association Publication, Springfield, 1900.

A very favorable, but apparently accurate account of Douglas' major activities is recorded by his friend and admirer, James W. Sheahan, The Life of Stephen A. Douglas, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1860. Clark E. Carr, Stephen A. Douglas: His Life, Public Services and Patriotism, A.C. McClurg and Company, Chicago, 1909, is a brief eulogy of Douglas but in its appendix are several of his noted speeches and a letter which he had written to Governor Matteson of Illinois.

A pamphlet containing a collection of the speeches of Senator Douglas is valuable because it includes speeches made outside of the Senate and consequently not in the Globe. A seven page pamphlet entitled The Record of Honorable Stephen A. Douglas on the Tariff was compiled from the official records of Congress for the People's State Committee of Pennsylvania. It was evidently compiled by Republicans to defeat Douglas' candidacy for President, but it seems to be an authentic history of the Senator's activities in Congress in regard to the tariff. Douglas' Last Speech given in Chicago is also available in pamphlet form.

The newspapers of this period, 1847-1861, are valuable in that they reveal the attitudes of the constituency toward its senator's policies and activities. The following were found for the most part to be supporters of Douglas: Galena Weekly Jeffersonian; Illinois State Register; Daily Democratic Press; Chicago Democrat; Daily Chicago Times. Those more inclined to be critical were Chicago Daily Journal; Chicago Weekly Journal; Illinois Republican (Belleville); Illinois State Journal (Springfield)

Secondary Material

For a concise and impartial account of the slavery question and the rise of sectionalism Arthur M. Schlesinger, A Political and Social History of the United States, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1928, is valuable. It also contains helpful bibliographies. Edward Channing, A History of the United States, vol.II, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1925, provides a good general view of the period 1848-1865. For a comprehensive account of Illinois between 1673-1884 Alexander Davidson and Bernard Stuve, A Complete History of Illinois 1673-1884, H.W. Rokker, Springfield, 1884, is most praiseworthy and valuable. It is based, according to the authors, upon public documents and upon Springfield newspaper files. John Moses, Illinois Historical and Statistical, II, Fergus Printing Company, 1889, is a well documented and complete history of the state up to the time of its publication. A collection of newspaper clippings presents some interesting stories of persons and events connected with the history of Illinois in John H. Todd, Illinois, Thy Wondrous Story, Chicago Herlad Company, Chicago, 1914. Of some value in depicting the relationship which existed between the early inhabitants of northern and southern Illinois is Robert S. Patterson, Early Society in Southern Illinois, Fergus Printing Company, Chicago, 1880.

Among the biographies of Douglas the most scholarly and the most frequently quoted is Allen Johnson, Stephen A. Douglas, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1908. He tries to show Douglas as the important figure of the period without seeking to glorify him. The author also had access to considerable source material. A rather lengthy bibliography makes Henry P. Willia, Stephen A. Douglas, Geo. W. Jacobs and Co., Philadelphia, 1910, helpful.

Thomas Wakefield Goodspeed, The University of Chicago Biographical Sketches, II, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1925, emphasizes the relation of Douglas to Illinois and Chicago, especially his part in founding a university in that city. Albert J. Beveridge, Abraham Lincoln 1809-1858, vol. II, Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston and New York, 1928, offers a very unbiased and complete account of the activities of Douglas. It is a painstaking, well documented, and interesting record of the pre-war period.

The story of the Illinois Central Railroad in Howard Gray Brownson's History of the Illinois Central Railroad to 1870, University of Illinois Press, Urbana, 1915, is well given. As well as an interesting account of the construction of the Illinois Central Railroad an enlightening report of the settlement of Illinois before 1850 is presented in Paul Wallace Gates, The Illinois Central Railroad and Its Colonization Work, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1934. It is based upon several manuscripts and material from the archives of the Illinois Central Railroads, and it contains a good bibliography. The author seems to make an effort to keep Douglas in the background.

On the question of the disposal of the public lands the following proved somewhat helpful. John Bell Sanborn, Congressional Grants of Land in Aid of Railways, University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, 1899; Thomas Donaldson, The Public Domain, Government Printing Office, Washington, 1884.

A very well documented and interestingly written account of slavery in Illinois may be found in N. Dwight Harris, The History of Negro Servitude in Illinois and the Slavery Agitation in that State, 1719-1864, A.C. McClurg and Company, Chicago, 1904. Arthur Charles Cole, The Era of the Civil War, 1848-1870, Illinois Centennial Commission, Springfield, 1919, is a valuable aid on both the railroad and the slavery issues. For a detailed account of the events leading up to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise see P.O. Ray, The Repeal of the Missouri Compromise, The Arthur H. Clark Co., Cleveland, 1909. One of the most recent works on the slavery issue and those personalities connected with it is George Fort Milton, The Eve of Conflict, Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston and New York, 1934. It is based upon newspapers, letters, and manuscripts. The author is an advocate of Douglas' policies, but he emphasizes Douglas' relation to the nation rather than to Illinois. In pamphlet form, F.I. Herriot, The Germans of Chicago and Stephen A. Douglas in 1854 gives a complete and detailed story of the German's attitude toward the Kansas-Nebraska Act.

Among the articles found in periodicals the following were especially helpful. Allen Johnson, "Illinois as a Constituency in 1850," in The Iowa Journal of History and Politics, III, July, 1905; Frank Heywood Hodder, "The Railroad Background of the Kansas-Nebraska Act," in The Mississippi Valley Historical Review, XII, June, 1925, March, 1926 points to the Act as a phase of commercial rivalry pertaining to the building of the Pacific Railroad; R.S. Cotterill, "The National Railroad Convention in St. Louis

1849," The Missouri Historical Review, XII, October 1917-July 1918;
Professor Frederick J. Turner, "The Middle West," The International
Monthly, IV, 1901.

The thesis, "The Relation of Stephen A. Douglas to the State of Illinois," written by E. Marie Haley has been accepted by the Graduate School with reference to form, and by the readers whose names appear below, with reference to content. It is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

John A. Zvetina, J.D., A.M. April 19, 1937

Paul Kiniery, Ph.D. March 26, 1937